Magistri Petri Lombardi
Arch. Episc. Parisiensis

Sententiarum Quatuor Libri

LIBER PRIMUS SENTENTIARUM.

DE DEI UNITATE ET TRINITATE

DISTINCTIO XVIII.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 319-321.
Cum Notitiis Editorum Quaracchi

Cap. I.

Utrum concedendum sit, per donum dari dona.

Hic quaeritur, cum Spiritus sanctus, per quem dividuntur dona, ipse sit donum, utrum concedendum sit, quod per donum dividantur ac dentur[1] dona. Ad quod dicimus, quia per donum, quod est Spiritus sanctus, singulis propria dividuntur, et ipsum communiter omnes boni habent. Unde Augustinus in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate[2] ait: « Per donum, quod est Spiritus sanctus, in commune omnibus membris Christi multa dona, quae sunt quibusque propria, dividuntur. Non enim singuli quique habent omnia, sed hi illa, alii alia, quamvis ipsum donum, a quo cuique propria dividuntur, omnes habeant id est Spiritum sanctum ». Ecce aperte dicit, per donum dona donari.

Cap. II.

Utrum Spiritus sanctus eadem ratione dicatur donum, qua datum sive donatum.

Praeterea diligenter considerandum est, cum Spiritus sanctus dicatur donum et datum, utrum[3] eadem ratione utrumque nomen ei conveniat; quod utique videri potest. Cum enim idem sit Spiritum sanctum dari et Spiritum sanctum donari, ex eadem ratione videtur Spiritus sanctus dici datum et donum. Hoc etiam videtur Augustinus significare in libro decimo quinto de Trinitate,[4] cum ait: « Spiritus sanctus in

Master Peter Lombard
Archbishop of Paris

The Four Books of Sentences

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES

ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY OF GOD

DISTINCTION 18

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 319-321.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Chapter I.

Whether it must be conceded, that gifts are given through a gift.

Here there is asked, since the Holy Spirit, through whom gifts are divided (among the faithful), is Himself a gift, whether it must be conceded, that through a gift gifts are divided and given.[1] To which we say, that through a gift, which is the Holy Spirit, (gifts) proper to each are divided, and all the good commonly have that (gift). Whence (St.) Augusti ne in the fifteenth book On the Trinity[2] says: « Through the gift, which is the Holy Spirit, the many gifts, which are proper to them, are divided in common to all the members of Christ. For no single one has them all, but these those, and those others, although the gift itself, by which (the gifts) proper to each are divided, all have, that is, the Holy Spirit ». Behold he openly says, that through a gift gifts are granted.

Chapter II.

Whether the Holy Spirit is said (to be) a "gift" for the same reason, that (He is said to be) " given" or "granted".

Besides it must be diligently considered, since the Holy Spirit is said (to be) a "gift" and a "given", whether[3] for the same reason each noun befits Him, as indeed it can seem (to be). For since it is that the Holy Spirit is given and that the Holy Spirit is granted, the Holy Spirit seems from the same reason to be said (to be) "given" and a "gift". This (St.) Augustine also seems to signify in the fifteenth book On the Trinity,[4]

tantum donum Dei est, in quantum datur eis quibus datur, apud se autem Deus est, etsi nemini detur ». Ecce aperte dicit, Spiritum sanctum donum appellari, quia datur. Si autem ex eo tantum appellatur donum, quia datur, non ab aeterno fuit donum, quia non datur nisi ex tempore.

when he says: « The Holy Spirit inasmuch as He is the Gift of God, insomuch is He given to those to whom He is given, but in Himself [apud se] He is God, even if He is given to no one ». Behold he openly says, that the Holy Spirit is named “gift”, because He is given. Moreover if form this only He is named “gift”, because He is given, He was not from eternity a “gift”, because He is not given, except in time.

Ad quod dicimus, quia Spiritus sanctus et donum dicitur et datum sive donatum, sed datum sive donaturm ex eo tantum dicitur, quia datur vel donatur, quod habet tantum ex tempore.

To which we say, that the Holy Spirit is both said (to be) “a gift” and “a given” or “a granted”, but is said (to be) “a given” or “a granted” for this only, that He is given and/or granted, which He has only in time.

Donum vero dicitur non ex eo tantum, quod donetur, sed ex proprietate, quam habuit ab aeterno; unde et ab aeterno fuit donum. Sempiterne enim donum fuit, non quia daretur, sed quia processit a Patre et Filio. Unde Augustinus in quarto libro de Trinitate[5] ait: « Sicut natum esse est Filio a Patre esse, ita Spiritui sancto donum Dei esse est a Patre procedere et a Filio ». Hic aperte ostenditur, quod Spiritus sanctus eo donum est, quod procedit a Patre et a[6] Filio, sicut Filius eo est a Patre, quod natus est ab eo. Non est enim idem Filio esse a Patre et Spiritui sancto, id est, non ea proprietate Filius dicitur esse a Patre, qua Spiritus sanctus. Nam Filius dicitur esse a Patre, quia genitus est ab eo; Spiritus sanctus vero dicitur esse a Patre et a Filio, quia Spiritus sanctus est donum Patris et Filii, id est, quia procedit ab utroque. Eo enim[7] dicitur Spiritus sanctus, quo donum; et eo donum, quo procedens. Unde Augustinus in quinto libro de Trinitate[8] ait: « Spiritus sanctus, qui non Trinitas, sed in Trinitate intelligitur, in eo quod proprie dicitur Spiritus sanctus, relative dicitur, cum et ad Patrem et ad Filium refertur, quia Spiritus sanctus et Patris et Filiis Spiritus est. Sed ipsa relatio non apparet in hoc nomine, apparet autem, cum dicitur donum Dei: donum enim est Patris et Filii, quia et a Patre procedit et a Filio ». Ecce his verbis aperte ostenditur, eadem relatione dici Spiritum sanctum et donum; donum autem, quia procedit a Patre et Filio. Proprietas ergo, qua dici- / -tur

On the other hand, He is said (to be) “a gift” not from this only, that He is granted, but from the property, which He had from eternity; wherefore He was also from eternity a gift. For sempiternally He was a gift, not because He was given, but because He proceeded from the Father and the Son. Wherefore, (St.) Augustine in the fourth book On the Trinity[5] says: « Just as for the Son ‘to have been born’ is ‘to be from the Father’, so for the Holy Spirit ‘to be the Gift of God’ is ‘to proceed from the Father and from the Son’ ». Here there is openly shown, that the Holy Spirit is a gift for this, that He proceeds from the Father and from[6] the Son, just as the Son is from the Father for this, that He has been born from Him. For it is not the same for the Son and the Holy Spirit to be from the Father, that is, the Son is not said to be from the Father by that property, by which the Holy Spirit (is). For the Son is said to be “from the Father”, because He has been begotten from Him; but the Holy Spirit is said to be “from the Father and from the Son”, because the Holy Spirit is the Gift of the Father and of the Son, that this, because He proceeds from Each. For[7] He is said (to be) “the Holy Spirit” for this, that (He is) the Gift; and “the Gift” for this, that (He is) proceeding. Wherefore (St.) Augustine in the fifth book On the Trinity[8] says: « The Holy Spirit, who (is) not the Trinity, but (rather) is understood (to be) in the Trinity, in this that He is properly said (to be) “the Holy Spirit”, is said (to be such) in a relative manner, when He is referred both to the Father and to the Son, because the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of both the Father and the Son. But

that relation does not appear in this name, but it does appear, when He is said (to be) "the Gift of God": for He is the Gift of the Father and of the Son, because He proceeds from the Father and from the Son ». Behold with these words there is openly shown, that the Holy Spirit is for the same reason also said (to be) "a gift"; but "a gift", because He proceeds from the Father and the Son. Therefore the property, whereby He is / said . . .

[1] Ed. 8 *dividuntur aut dantur*: particulam *aut* pro *ac* habet etiam ed. 1.
[2] Cap. 19. n. 34. — In fine textus ante *id est* sola Vat. *habent* pro *habeant*, et ed. 4 peius *habeantur*. Subinde edd. 1, 2, 3, 7 omittunt *Ecce*, et pro ultimo vero *donari* edd. 1, 8 legunt *dari*.
[3] Ed. 4, 5, 6, 9 adiiciunt *et*.
[4] Cap. 19. n. 36. — In fine loci Vat. et aliae edd. contra originale, codd. et edd. 1, 8 *datur* loco *detur*.
[5] Cap. 20. n. 29.
[6] Codd., excepto A, et edd. 1, 8 omittunt *a*.
[7] Codd. omittunt *enim*.
[8] Cap. 11. n. 12. — In hoc textu contra codd., ed. 1 et originale, Vat. cum aliis edd. addit *est* ante *Trinitas*. Eadem Vat. cum pluribus edd. ante *Filium* omittit *ad*. — Ultima verba textus: *et a Filio*, ab Augustino exprimuntur sic: *Et quod Apostolus ait: qui Spiritum Christi non habet, hic non est eius* (Rom. 8, 9.) *de ipso utique sancto Spiritu ait*.

[1] Edition 8 has these two verbs in the indicative: edition 1 also has the particle *or* [aut] for *and* [ac].
[2] Chapter 19, n. 34. — At the end of this text before *that is* [id est] only the Vatican edition has the indicative form of *have* [habent], and edition 4 the worse *are had* [habeantur]. Then editions 1, 2, 3 and 7 omit *Behold* [Ecce], and for very last word *are granted* [donari] editions 1 and 8 have *are given* [dari].
[3] Editions 4, 5, 6 and 9 insert *also* [et].
[4] Chapter 19, n. 36. — At the end of the quote, the Vatican edition and the other editions, contrary to the original, to the codices and to editions 1 and 8, have the indicative *is given* [datur].
[5] Chapter 20, n. 29.
[6] The codices, except A, and editions 1 and 8, omit *from* [a].
[7] The codices omit *For* [enim].
[8] Chapter 11, n. 12. — In this text, contrary to the codices, edition 1 and the original, and the Vatican edition, together with the other editions, add *is* [est] before the first *Trinity* [Trinitas]. The same Vatican edition, together with very many editions, before *the Son* [Filium] omits *to* [ad]. The last words of the text: *and from the Son* [et a Filio], are expressed by (St.) Augustine in this manner: *And that which the Apostle says: he who does not have the Spirit of Christ, does not belong to Him* (Rom. 8:9), *indeed speaks of the Holy Spirit Himself*.

dici- /-tur Spiritus sanctus vel donum, processio ipsa est, de qua post plenius agemus cum aliis.[1] Cum ergo ab aeterno processerit ab utroque, et ab aeterno donum fuit. Non ergo Spiritus sanctus eo tantum dicitur donum, quia donatur; nam et ante fuit donum, quam donaretur. Unde Augustinus in quinto libro de Trinitate:[2] «Semper procedit Spiritus sanctus, et non ex tempore, sed ab eternitate procedit; sed quia sic procedebat, ut esset donabile, iam donum erat, antequam esset cui daretur. Aliter enim intelligitur, cum dicitur donum, aliter cum dicitur donatum: nam donum potest esse etiam, antequam detur;

said (to be) "the Holy Spirit" and/or "a gift", is the procession itself, with which we will deal more fully afterwards together with the other (properties).[1] Therefore since He proceeded from eternity from Each, He was also from eternity a gift. Therefore the Holy Spirit is not said (to be) "a gift" for this only, that He is granted; for He was also a gift before He was granted. Whence (St.) Augustine in the fifth book <u>On the Trinity</u> (says):[2] « The Holy Spirit always proceeds, and He proceeds not in time, but from eternity; but because He was thus proceeding, to be grantable, He already was a gift, before there was that to which He

donatum autem, nisi datum fuerit, nullo modo dici potest ». « Sempiterne ergo Spiritus sanctus est donum, temporaliter autem donatum ». His verbis aperte ostenditur, quod sicut Spiritus sanctus ab aeterno procedit, ita ab aeteno donum est; non quia donaretur a Patre Filio, vel a Filio Patri, sed quia ab aeterno processit donabilis.

would be given. For it is understood in one manner, when there is said "a gift", in another when there is said "a granted": for "a given" can also be, before it is given; but "a granted", unless it will have been given, in no manner can be said ». « Therefore the Holy Spirit is sempiternally a gift, but temporally a granted ». With these words there is openly shown, that just as the Holy Spirit proceeds from eternity, so is He a gift from eternity, not because He was given by the Father to the Son, and/or by the Son to the Father, but because from eternity He has proceeded as "a grantable".

Sed quaeritur, cui donabilis: utrum Patri et Filio, an tantum nobis, qui nondum eramus? Si autem non erat donabilis Patri et Filio, sed tantum nobis, et ex eo donum erat, quia sic donabilis procedebat, videtur quod Filius eadem ratione semper donum fuerit; quia ab aeterno processit a Patre donabilis nobis in tempore. Nam et de Filio legitur,[3] quod *datus est nobis*. Ad quod dicimus, quia Spiritus sanctus nobis tantum, non Patri vel Filio, donabilis processit, sicut et nobis tantum datus est. Et Filius vere datus est nobis et ab aeterno processit a Patre, non ut donabilis tantum, sed ut genitus, qui et donari posset. Processit ergo ut genitus et donabilis; sed Spiritus sanctus non procedit ut genitus, sed tantum ut donum. Donum autem semper fuit, non solum quia donabilis, sed quia ab utroque processit, et quia[4] donabilis fuit. Unde Augustinus in quinto libro de Trinitate[5] ait: « Eo ipso, quod daturus erat eum Deus, iam donum erat, etiam antequam daretur », et ideo donabilis[6]; sed aliter donabilis quam Filius; nam et aliter datus et aliter processit quam Filius. Filii enim processio genitura est vel nativitas, Spiritus sancti vero processio nativitas non est; utraque vero ineffabilis est.

But there is asked, "a grantable" to whom: whether to the Father and to the Son, or whether only to us, who were not yet? But if He was not grantable to the Father and to the Son, but only to us, and was a gift from this, that He was proceeding in this manner as a grantable, it seems that the Son for the same reason always was a gift; because from eternity He proceeded from the Father as grantable to us in time. For it is also read of the Son,[3] that He *is given to us*. To which we say, that the Holy Spirit proceeded as a grantable only to us, not to the Father and/or to the Son, just as also He has only been given to us. And the Son has been truly given to us and has from eternity proceeded from the Father, not only as a grantable; but as One begotten, who also could be granted. Therefore, He proceeded as One begotten and grantable; but the Holy Spirit does not proceed as One begotten, but only as the Gift. Moreover He always was a gift, not only because (His is) grantable, but because He proceeded from Each, and because[4] He was grantable. Wherefore (St.) Augustine in the fifth book <u>On the Trinity</u>[5] says: « By the very fact, that God was going to give Him, He was already a gift, even before He was given », and for that reason (He was)[6] grantable; but grantable in a manner other than the Son; for He (has been) both given and has proceeded in a manner other than the Son. For the procession of the Son is a begetting [genitura] and/or nativity, but the procession of the Holy Spirit is not a nativity; however each is ineffable.

Cap. III.

Quod sicut Filius nascendo accepit non

Chapter III

That just as the Son by being born

tantum, ut esset Filius, sed etiam essentia, ita Spiritus sanctus procedendo accepit non tantum, ut esset donum, sed ut esset essentia.

accepted not only, 'to be the Son', but also '(to be) the Essence', so the Holy Spirit by proceeding accepted not only, 'to be a gift', but 'to be the Essence'.

Et notandum, quod sicut Filius nascendo accepit non tantum, ut Filius sit, sed omnino ut sit et ut ipsa substantia sit, ita et Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio procedendo accepit non tantum, ut Spiritus sanctus sit vel donum, sed etiam, ut omnino sit et ut substantia sit; quod utique non accepit eo quo[7] datur. Nam cum non detur nisi ex tempore, si hoc haberet eo quo detur, accepisset ergo ex tempore, ut esset. Unde Augustinus in quinto libro de Trinitate[8] ait: « Filius non hoc tantum habet nascendo, ut Filius sit, sed omnino ut sit. Quaeritur ergo, utrum Spiritus sanctus eo quo datur habeat non tantum, ut donum sit, sed omnino ut sit. Quod si non est, nisi quia datur, id est, si non habet esse, nisi eo quo datur, sicut Filius nascendo habet non tantum, ut sit Filius, quod relative dicitur, sed omnino ut sit ipsa substantia, quomodo iam Spiritus sanctus erat ipsa substantia, cum non prius daretur, quam esset cui daretur »? Non ergo eo quo datur, sed procedendo habet, ut sit donum, et ut sit essentia; sicut Filius non eo quod datus est, sed nascendo accepit non tantum, ut sit Filius, sed ut sit essentia. Unde Augustinus in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate[9] ait: « Sicut Filio praestat essentiam sine initio temporis, sine ulla mutabilitate naturae de Patre generatio, ita Spiritui sancto praestat essentiam sine ullo initio temporis, sine ulla mutabilitate naturae de utroque processio ».

And it must be noted, that just as the Son by being born accepted [accepit] not only, 'to be the Son', but 'entirely to be' and 'to be the Substance Itself', so also the Holy Spirit by proceeding from the Father and the Son accepted not only, 'to be the Holy Spirit and/or a gift', but also, 'to entirely be' and 'to be the Substance'; which indeed He did not accept for the reason that[7] He is given. For since He is not given but in time, if He would have this for the reason that He is given, He would have accepted, therefore, in time, to be. Wherefore (St.) Augustine in the fifth book <u>On the Trinity</u>[8] says: « The Son by being born not only has this, that He is the Son, but entirely that He is. Therefore, there is asked, whether the Holy Spirit for this, that He is given, has not only, that He is a gift, but entirely that He is. Which if He is not, unless because He is given, that is, if He does not have "being" [esse], unless for this, that He is given, just as the Son by being born has not only, that He is the Son, which is said in a relative manner, but entirely to be the Substance Itself, in what manner was the Holy Spirit the Substance Itself, since He was not given before there was that to which He was given »? Therefore, not for this, that He is given, but by proceeding does He have, that He is a gift, and that He is the Essence; just as the Son not for this, that He has been given, but by being born accepts not only, 'to be the Son', but 'to be the Essence'. Wherefore (St.) Augustine in the fifteenth book <u>On the Trinity</u>[9] says: « Just as the generation presents [praestat] the Essence to the Son without the beginning [initio] of time, without any changeability in the Nature of the Father [mutabilitate naturae de Patre], so the procession presents the Essence to the Holy Spirit without any beginning of time, without any changeability of the Nature of Each ».

Hic oritur quaestio: si Filius nascendo habet non tantum, ut sit Filius, sed ut sit essentia, et Spiritus sanctus procedendo non tantum, ut sit donum, sed ut sit essentia; ergo et Filius nativitate essentia est, et Spiritus sanctus processione essentia est; cum alibi

Here there arises the question: 'if the Son by being born has not only, that He is the Son, but that He is the Essence, and the Holy Spirit by proceeding not only, that He is a gift, but that He is the Essence; is, therefore, both the Son by the nativity the

dicatur, quod nec Pater eo Pater est, quo Deus, nec Filius eo Filius, quo Deus, nec Spiritus sanctus eo donum, quo Deus; quia, ut ait Augustinus in septimo libro de Trinitate,[10] « his nominibus relativa eorum ostenduntur, non essentia ». Unde post plenius agemus.[11]

Essence, and is the Holy Spirit by the procession, the Essence?'; since elsewhere there is said, that neither the Father for this, that (He is) God, is the Father, nor the Son for this, that (He is) God, is the Son, nor the Holy Spirit for this, that (He is) God, a gift; because, as (St.) Augustine says in the seventh book On the Trinity,[10] « with these names those (things) relative to Them are shown, not (Their) Essence ». With which we will more fully deal afterwards.[11]

Ad quod breviter respondentes dicimus, quia nec Filius nativitate essentia est, sed tantum Filius; nec Spiritus sanctus processione essentia est, sed tantum donum; et tamen uterque, et ille nascendo et iste procedendo, accepit, ut esset essentia. « Non enim, ut ait Hilarius in quinto libro de Trinitate,[12] per defectionem, aut protensionem, aut derivationem ex Deo Deus est, sed ex virtute naturae in naturam eandem nativitate subsistit Filius », et ex virtute naturae in naturm eandem processione subsistit Spiritus sanctus.

To which responding briefly, we say, that neither is the Son by the nativity the Essence, but only the Son; nor is the Holy Spirit by the procession the Essence, but only the Gift; and yet Each, both the Former by being born and the Latter by proceeding, accepts, 'to be the Essence'. « For not », as (St.) Hilary says in the fifth book On the Trinity,[12] « through a defection, or an extension [protensionem], or a derivation from God is He God, but (rather) the Son subsists by the nativity, out of the virtue of the Nature upon [in] the same Nature », and out of the virtue of the Nature upon the same Nature, does the Holy Spirit (also) subsist.

Quod ita intelligi potest: ex Patre, qui est virtus ingenita, naturam, quam habet, eandem Filius nativiate, id est nascendo, et Spiritus sanctus processione, id est procedendo habet. Unde ipse idem apertius eloquens, . . .

Which can thus be understood: out of the Father, who is the Unbegotten Virtue, the Nature, which He has, the Same the Son by the nativity, that is by being born, and the Holy Spirit by the procession, that is by proceeding, has. Whence saying the same more openly, . . .

---

[1] Supple cum ed. 1 *proprietatibus*, de quibus agitur hic et dist. XXVI. XXVIII. XXIX.
[2] Cap. 15. n. 16. — Et sequens locus est ibid. c. 16. n. 17. — In primo loco ante *Aliter* Vat. cum pluribus edd. contra originale, codd. et edd. 1, 8 *donaretur*.
[3] Isai. 9, 6.
[4] Vat. et edd. 4, 6 omittunt *quia*.
[5] Cap. 45. n. 16.
[6] Contra codd. et ed. 1 Vat. cum aliis edd. addit *est*, sed potius referendum est *donabilis* ad praecedens *erat*. Paulo post Vat. et edd. 4, 6, 9 *datur* pro *datus*, ed. 8 *datus est*. — Ultima sententia quoad sensum sumta est ex libr. II. contra Maximinum c. 14. n. 1.
[7] Vat. et plures edd. hic paulo post *ex eo quod* pro *eo quo*. Particula *ex* omittitur ab omnibus codd. et ed. 1, hic et in sequenti textu Augustini; *quo* legunt hic et in textu Augustini codd. B D. Alii codd. in textu quidem Augustini habet *quo*; extra ipsum vero modo *quo*, modo *quod*. Cum originali Augustini semper posuimus *quo*.
[8] Cap. 15. n. 16, sed diffusius. Ex codd. A C D inseruimus *ait*, quod deest in editis.
[9] Cap. 26. n. 47. — Paulo ante Vat., omittendo *sit*,

---

[1] Supply with edition 1 *properties*, with which this and Distinctions XXVI, XXVIII, and XXIX deal.
[2] Chapter 15, n. 16. — And the following passage is ibid., ch. 16, n. 17. — In the first passage, at the beginning of the sentence *For it is understood* etc. [Aliter etc.] there is in the Vatican edition and very many editions, contrary to the original, to the codices, and to editions 1 and 8, *He would be given* [donaretur].
[3] Isaiah 9:6
[4] The Vatican edition and editions 4 and 6, omit *because* [quia].
[5] Chapter 45, n. 16.
[6] Contrary to the codices and to edition 1, the Vatican edition, together with the other editions adds *He is* [est], but *grantable* [donabilis] must rather be referred to the preceding *was* [erat]. A little after this the Vatican edition and editions 4, 6, and 9, have *is given* [datur] for *(has been) given* [datus], edition 8 reads *has been given* [datus est]. — The last sentence has been taken according to its sense from Against Maximinus, Bk. II, ch. 14, n. 1.
[7] The Vatican edition and very many editions, here

mendose legit *ut essentia*. Eadem Vat. cum pluribus edd. omittit in textu Augustini *ulla* ante *mutabilitate*.
[10] Cap. 2. n. 3, sed mutato verborum ordine.
[11] Dist. XXVI. XXVII. XXIX.
[12] Num. 37. — In originali Hilarii melius legitur: *per desectionem* loco *per defectionem*, quod habent omnes edd., codd. et etiam editiones Commentatorum, ut Bonav., hic dub. 4, S. Thomas in expositione textus.

and a little after this, have *from this that* [ex eo quod] for *for the reason that* [eo quod]. The particle *from* [ex] is omitted by all the codices and edition 1, here and in the following text of (St.) Augustine; *that* [quo] is read here in the text of (St.) Augustine and in codices B and C. The other codices in the text of (St.) Augustine indeed have *that* [quo]; but for this, that now one has *that* [quo], now another *that* [quod]. With the original of (St.) Augustine we have always put *that* [quo].
[8] Chapter 15, n. 16, but more diffusely. From codices A C and D we have inserted *says* [ait], which is lacking in the editions.
[9] Chapter 26, n. 47. — A little before this the Vatican edition, by omitting *be* [sit], faultily reads *as the Essence* [ut essentia]. The same Vatican edition, together with very many editions, omits in the text of (St.) Augustine *any* [ulla] before *changeability* [mutabilitate].
[10] Chapter 2, n. 3, but with a changed order of words.
[11] Distinctions XXVI, XXVII, and XXIX.
[12] N. 37. — In the original of (St.) Hilary there is better read: *through a dissection* [per desectionem] for *through a defection* [per defectionem], which all the editions, the codices and even the editions of the Commentators, such as (St.) Bonaventure, here in dubium 4, and St. Thomas, in the exposition of the text.

---

quod dixerat aperit, subdens:[1] « Nativitas, inquit, Dei non potest non eam, de qua profecta est, tenere naturam. Non enim aliud quam Deus subsistit, quod non aliunde quam de Deo subsistit ». Ecce his verbis aperitur, quomodo accipiendum sit illud:[2] « De Patre generatio praestat essentiam Filio, et de utroque procesio praestat essentiam Spiritui sancto »; non quia ille essentia sit Filius, et iste essentia sit Spiritus sanctus, immo proprietate personali, sed quia et ille nascendo, et iste procedendo essentiam habet eandem et totam, quae in Patre est.

(St. Augustine) reveals [aperit], what he had said, subjoining:[1] « The nativity of God », he says « cannot not hold that Nature, by which it has come forth [profecta est]. For no Other than God subsists, because from nowhere else than from God does He subsist ». Behold with these words he reveals, in what manner this must be accepted:[2] « From the Father the generation presents the Essence to the Son, and from Each the procession presents the Essence to the Holy Spirit »; not because the Former by the Essence is the Son, and the Latter by the Essence is the Holy Spirit, nay by the personal property (of Each), but because both the Former by being born, and the Latter by proceeding, have the same and the whole Essence, which is in the Father.

Cap. IV.

Quod Spiritus sanctus dicitur donum et donatum secundum duos modos praedictos processionis, qui, secundum quod donum est, refertur ad Patrem et Filium, secundum quod datum, ad eum qui dedit et ad eos

Chapter IV

That the Holy Spirit is said (to be) a “gift” and a “granted” according to the two aforesaid manners of procession, who, according to which He is a gift, is referred to the Father and the Son, according to which

quibus datur.

a given, to Him who gives and to those to whom He is given.

Ex praedictis patet, quod Spiritus sanctus sempiterne donum est et temporaliter datum vel donatum. Ex quo apparet illa distinctio geminae processionis, de qua supra egimus.[3] Nam secundum alteram processionem dicitur donatum vel datum, secundum alteram vero dicitur donum.

From the aforesaid it is clear, that the Holy Spirit is a gift sempiternally, and temporally (is) a given and/or a granted. From which appears that distinction of the twin procession, with which we have dealt above.[3] For according to the latter procession He is said (to be) "a granted" and/or "a given", but according to the former He is said (to be) "the Gift".

Et secundum hoc, quod sempiterne donum est, refertur ad Patrem et Filium, secundum hoc vero, quod dicitur datum vel donatum, et ad eum qui dedit refertur, et ad eos quibus datur; et eius dicitur esse qui dat, et illorum quibus datur. Unde Augustinus in quinto libro de Trinitate[4] ait: « Quod datum est et ad eum qui dedit refertur, et ad eos quibus dedit. Itaque Spiritus sanctus non tantum Patris et Filii, qui dederunt, sed etiam *noster* dicitur, qui accepimus. Spiritus ergo et Dei est, qui dedit, et noster, qui accepimus; non ille spiritus noster, quo sumus, quia ipse *spiritus* est *hominis, qui in ipso est*:[5] quamvis et illum spiritum, qui hominis dicitur, utique accepimus; sed aliter iste, aliter ille *noster* dicitur. Aliud est enim quod accepimus, ut essemus, aliud quod accepimus, ut sancti essemus. Quod autem Spiritus sanctus noster dicatur, Scriptura ostendit. Scriptum est enim de Ioanne, quod *in Spiritu Eliae* veniret.[6] Ecce dictus est Eliae Spiritus, scilicet Spiritus sanctus, quem accepit Elias. Et Moysi ait Dominus:[7] *Tollam de spiritu tuo et dabo eis*, id est, dabo illis de Spiritu sancto, quem iam dedi tibi ». Ecce et hic dictus est spiritus Moysi. Patet igitur, quia Spiritus sanctus noster dicitur spiritus, scilicet[8] quia nobis datus et datus utique ad hoc, ut sancti essemus. Spiritus vero creatus ad hoc est datus, ut essemus.

And according to this, that He is sempiternally a gift, He is referred to the Father and the Son, but according to this, that He is said (to be) "a given" and/or "a granted", He is referred both to him who gives, and to those to whom He is given, and He is said (to be) of him, who gives, and to those to whom He is given. Whence (St.) Augustine in the fifth book On the Trinity[4] says: « Because He is "a given", He is referred both to him who has given, and to those to whom he gave. And so the Holy Spirit is said (to be) not only "of the Father" and "of the Son", who gave (Him), but also "*ours*", who accepted (Him). Therefore the Spirit is both God's, who gave, and ours, who accepted; not that spirit of ours, by which we are, because (that) is the *spirit of a man, which is in him*:[5] but in one manner the Former, in another the latter, is ("a spirit") said (to be) *ours*. For one is that which we accepted, to be, the Other that which we accepted, to be holy. Moreover, that the Holy Spirit is said (to be) ours, Scripture shows. For it is written of (St.) John (the Baptist), that he came *in the Spirit of Elijah*.[6] Behold the Spirit was said (to be) "of Elijah", that is the Holy Spirit, whom Elijah accepted. And to Moses the Lord says:[7] *I shall take of thy spirit and I shall give (it) to them*, that is, I shall give them of the Holy Spirit, whom I have already given to thee ». Behold here also He is said (to be) the spirit "of Moses". Therefore it is clear, that the Holy Spirit is said (to be) "our spirit", that is,[8] because (He has been) given to us, and given indeed for this, that we be holy. However the created spirit has been given for this, that we be.

Cap. V.

An Filius, cum sit nobis datus, possit dici noster, ut Spiritus sanctus.

Chapter V

Whether the Son, since He has been given to us, can be said (to be) "ours", as the Holy

Spirit (is).

Hic quaeritur, utrum et Filius, cum sit nobis datus, dicatur vel possit dici *noster*. Ad quod dicimus, quia[9] Filius dicitur noster panis, noster redemptor et huiusmodi; sed non dicitur noster Filius, quia Filius dicitur relative tantum ad eum qui genuit. Et ideo noster Filius non potest dici, sed Patris tantum. In eo autem quod dicitur *datus*, et ad eum qui dedit, et ad eos quibus datus est, refertur, ut[10] Spiritus sanctus; qui etiam cum in Scriptura, ut praedictum est, dicatur spiritus noster, vel spiritus tuus vel illius ut de Moyse et Elia dictum est, nusquam tamen in Scriptura occurrit ita dici: Spiritus sanctus noster vel tuus vel illius, sed spiritus noster vel tuus vel illius, quia Spiritus sanctus eo dicitur, quo donum, et utrumque relative dicitur ad Patrem et ad[11] Filium, et hoc sempiterna relatione. Si tamen aliquando dicitur donum nostrum, accipitur donum pro donato vel dato. Cum vero donum accipitur eo modo, quo Spiritus sanctus, donum[12] tantum Patris et Filii dicitur, non hominis; ita et Filius sub hac appellatione non potest dici *noster*, ut dicatur Filius noster, sicut nec dicitur Spiritus sanctus noster; et tamen de Filio dicitur panis noster, et de Spiritu spiritus noster. Ille noster panis, quia nos reficit nobis datus; iste noster spiritus, quia nobis inspiratur a Patre et Filio, et in nobis spirat, sicut vult. Unde Augustinus in quinto libro de Trinitate[13] ait: « Quod de Patre natum est ad Patrem solum refertur, cum dicitur Filius; et ideo Filius Patris est, et non noster. Dicimus tamen et *panem nostrum da nobis*, sicut dicimus, spiritum nostrum ».

Here there is asked, whether the Son also, since He has been given to us, is said and/or can be said (to be) "*ours*". To which we way, that[9] the Son is said (to be) "our Bread", "Our Redeemer" and (things) of this kind; but is not said (to be) "our Son", because "the Son" is said in a manner relative only to Him who begets. And for that reason He cannot be said (to be) "our Son", but the Father's only. Moreover, in this that He is said (to have been) *given*, He is both referred to Him who gave, and to those to whom He has been given, as the Holy Spirit (is);[10] who also, since in the Scripture, as has been said before, is said (to be) "our spirit", and/or "thy spirit" and/or "his", as has been said of Moses and Elijah, yet never in Scripture does it thus occur that there be said: "our Holy Spirit" and/or "thy" and/or "his", but "our spirit" and/or "thy" and/or "his", because He is said (to be) "the Holy Spirit" for this, that (He is) "a gift", and each (name) is said in a manner relative to the Father and to[11] the Son, and this by a sempiternal relation. Yet, if at any time He is said (to be) "our gift", "gift" is accepted as "granted" and/or "given". However, when "gift" is accepted in the manner, whereby (He is) the Holy Spirit, He is said only[12] (to be) the Gift "of the Father and the Son", not "of a man"; thus also the Son cannot be said (to be) "*ours*" under this appellation, that He be said (to be) "our Son", just as neither is the Holy Spirit said (to be) "ours", and yet of the Son there is said "our Bread", and of the Spirit "our spirit". The Former (is) "our Bread", because as One given to us He refects us; the Latter "our spirit", because He breathes into us from the Father and the Son, and breathes in us, as He will. Whence (St.) Augustine in the fifth book <u>On the Trinity</u>[13] says: « What has been born of the Father is referred to the Father alone, when there is said "the Son"; and for that reason He is the Son of the Father, and not ours. Yet, we do also say "*give us . . . our daily Bread*", just as we say, "our spirit" ».

Cap. VI.

Utrum Spiritus sanctus ad se ipsum referatur.

Post haec quaeritur, utrum Spiritus sanctus

Chapter VI

Whether the Holy Spirit is referred to Himself.

After these there is asked, whether the Holy

ad se ipsum referatur: hoc enim videtur ex praedictis posse probari. Si enim quod datur refertur ad eum qui dat, et ad eum cui datur; et Spiritus sanctus datur a se ipso, ut praedictum est, ergo refertur ad se ipsum. Huius quaestionis determinationem in posterum differimus, donec tractemus de his quae relative dicuntur de Deo ex tempore,[14] in quibus datum et donatum continentur.

Spirit is referred to Himself: for this seems to be able to be proven from the aforesaid. For if because He is given He is referred to him who gives, and to him to whom He is given, and the Holy Spirit is given by Himself, as has been said before, therefore He is referred to Himself. The determination of this question we defer to later, when we shall treat of those (things) which are said in a relative manner, on account of time,[14] of God, among which are contained the "given" and the "granted".

---

[1] Loc. cit., paucis interpositis. — Vat. et plures edd. legunt: *dicens* pro *subdens*, et sola Vat. addit *ut* ante *inquit*.
[2] Scil. August., libr. XV. de Trin. c. 26. n. 47: cfr. supa pag. 320 notam 9. — Immediate ante loco *accipiendum* Vat. cum pluribus edd. *intelligendum*.
[3] Dist. XIV.
[4] Cap. 14. n. 15.
[5] Alludit Augustinus ad I. Cor. 2, 11: *Quis enim hominum scit, quae sunt hominis, nisi spiritus hominis, qui in ipso est?*
[6] Luc. 1, 17. — Immediate post Vat. sola cum originali omittit *Ecce*.
[7] Num. 11, 17. Vulgata: *Auferam de Spirituo tuo tradamque eis*. — Solummodo Vat. locum detruncte legit, lineam omittendo, nempe: tuo et dabo eis, id est, dabo illis de Spiritu.
[8] Vat. et plures edd. *sed* contra codd. A D et ed. 1. Cod. C glossando: *Spiritus, non quod sumus, sed quia nobis datur*.
[9] Codd. B E et edd. 1, 8 *quod*. Sed familiare est Magistro adhibere *quia* pro *quod*. — Subinde sequimur codd. B C D E in positione verborum, dum editi legunt *tantum relative*; idem codd. habent *illum* pro *eum*.
[10] Solummodo Vat. et ed. 4 superflue addunt *et* post *ut*. — Deinde eadem Vat. cum pluribus edd. *supra dictum est* loco *praedictum est*.
[11] Vat. ed edd. 1, 8 omittunt *ad*.
[12] Vat. cum aliis edd., sed contradicentibus edd. 1, 6, 8 et codd., omittit *tantum*. — Mox post *et Filius* ed. 1 adiicit *Dei*.
[13] Cap. 14. n. 15, sed apud Magistrum truncate. Respicitur ad orationem Domini, Matth. 6, 11, Luc. 11, 3.
[14] Dist. XXX.

---

[1] Loc. cit., with a few words interposed. — The Vatican edition and very many editions read *saying* [dicens] for *subjoining* [subdens], and only the Vatican edition adds *as* [ut] before *he says* [inquit].
[2] Namely, (St.) Augustine, On the Trinity., Bk. XV, ch. 26, n. 47: cf. above p. 320, footnote 9. — Immediately before this, in place of *accepted* [accipiendum] the Vatican edition, together with very many editions, has *understood* [intelligendum].
[3] Distinction XIV.
[4] Chapter 14, n. 15.
[5] (St.) Augustine alludes to 1 Cor. 2:11: *For who of men knows, what are a man's, except the spirit of the man, which is in him?* [Quis enim hominum scit, quae sunt hominis, nisi spiritus hominis, qui in ipso est?]
[6] Lk. 1:17. — Immediately after this the Vatican edition alone, together with the original, omits *Behold* [Ecce].
[7] Num. 11:17. The Vulgate reads: *I shall take of thy Spirit and I shall give to them* [Auferam de Spiritu tuo tradamque eis]. — Only the Vatican edition exhibits a truncated passage, by omitting an entire line, namely: *thy Spirit and I shall give (Him) to them, that is, I shall given them of the Spirit* [tuo et dabo eis, id est, dabo illis de Spiritu].
[8] The Vatican edition and very many editions read *but* [sed], contrary to codices A an D and to edition 1. Codex C by glossing reads: *the Spirit, that which we are, but because He is given to us* [Spiritus, non quod sumus, sed quia nobis datur].
[9] Codices B and E and editions 1 and 8 *that* [quod]. But it is common for Master (Peter) to employ *because* [quia] for *that* [quod]. — Then we follow codices B C D and E according to the position of the words, while the editions read *only in a relative manner* [tantum relative]; the same codices have *to the One* [ad illud] for *to Him* [ad eum].
[10] Only the Vatican edition and edition 4 superfluously adds *is* [et] after *as* [ut]. — Then the same Vatican edition, together with very many editions, reads *has been said above* [supra dictum est] for *has been said before* [praedictum est].
[11] The Vatican edition and editions 1 and 8 omits *to* [ad].
[12] The Vatican edition together with the other editions, but with editions 1, 6 and 8, and the codices contradicting this, omits *only* [tantum]. Next after *also the Son* [et Filius] edition one inserts *of God*

[Dei].
[13] Chapter 14, n. 15, but in truncated form in Master (Peter)'s text. This refers to the Lord's Prayer, Mt. 6:11, Lk. 11:3.
[14] Distinction XXX.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVIII.

De proprietate Spiritus sancti, secundum quam ei convenit temporaliter procedere.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio I.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 322-324.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Hic quaeritur, cum Spiritus sanctus, per quem dividuntur dona, ipse sit donum etc.

DIVISIO TEXTUS.

Haec est tertia pars huius partis, in qua Magister agit de processione Spiritus sancti temporali. Determinato enim *principio*, a quo Spiritus sanctus procedit, determinato etiam *modo*, secundum quem procedit, determinat hic Magister *proprietatem*, secundum quam convenit ei temporaliter

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVIII

On the property of the Holy Spirit, according to which it befits Him to proceed temporally.

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 1

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 322-324.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Here there is asked, since the Holy Spirit, through whom gifts are divided, is Himself a gift etc..

DIVISION OF THE TEXT

This is the third part of this part, in which Master (Peter) deals with the temporal procession of the Holy Spirit. For having determined the *principle*, from which the Holy Spirit proceeds, having determined also the *manner*, according to which He proceeds, Master (Peter) determines here

procedere; et haec proprietas est donum, et de hac in tota praesenti distinctione intendit agere. Dividitur autem haec pars in quatuor partes secundum quatuor quaestiones, quas movet.

the *property*, according to which it befits [convenit] Him to proceed temporally; and this property is “gift”, and he intends to deal with this in the entire present distinction. Moreover, this part is divided into four parts, according to the four questions, which he moves.

In *prima* quaerit et determinat, utrum Spiritus sanctus sit donum, in quo[1] alia dona donantur.

In the *first* he asks and determines, whether the Holy Spirit is the Gift, in which[1] the other gifts are granted.

In *secunda* quaerit,[2] utrum Spiritus sanctus sit eadem ratione datum et donum, ibi: *Praeterea diligenter considerandum est, cum Spiritus sanctus dicatur donum et datum*.

In the *second* he asks,[2] whether the Holy Spirit is a “given” and a “gift” for the same reason, there (where he says): *Besides it must be diligently considered, since the Holy Spirit is said (to be) a gift and a given.*

In *tertia* quaerit, cum non solum Spiritus sanctus, sed etiam Filius sit datus, quare non dicitur *Filius noster*, sicut *Spiritus noster*, ibi: *Hic quaeritur, utrum Filius, cum sit nobis datus* etc.

In the *third* he asks, since not only the Holy Spirit, but also the Son has been given, for what reason is (the Latter) not said (to be) *our Son*, just as (the Former) *our Spirit*, there (where he says): *Here there is asked, whether the Son also, since He has been given to us* etc..

In *quarta* et ultima quaerit, cum Spiritus sanctus sit donum relative, quomodo possit a se dari; si enim a se donatur,[3] videtur Spiritus sanctus ad se relative dici, et hoc facit ibi: *Post haec quaeritur, utrum Spiritus sanctus ad se ipsum referatur*.

In the *fourth* and last he asks, since the Holy Spirit is “a gift” in a relative manner, in what manner can He be given by Himself; for if He is granted[3] by Himself, “the Holy Spirit” seems to be said in a manner relative to Himself, and this he does there: *After these there is asked, whether the Holy Spirit is referred to Himself.*

Ceteris partibus indivisis remanentibus, quia specialiter prosequitur quaestiones praedictas, media sive *secunda* pars, quae est de differentia doni vel[4] dati, habet quatuor partes. In prima quaerit et determinat, quod non eadem ratione Spiritus sanctus dicitur donum et datum, quia donum est ab aeterno, sed datum ex tempore. In secunda vero contra hoc, scilicet quod Spiritus sanctus sit donum aeternaliter, obiicit, ibi: *Sed quaeritur, cui donabilis, utrum Patri, vel Filio*. In tertio vero, quia in solutione dixerat quoddam dubium, ideo incidenter movet et determinat illud, ibi: *Hic oritur quaestio, si Filius nascendo* etc. In quarta vero et ultima redit ad primam solutionem, ostendens, quod Spiritus sanctus aeternaltier donum est, quia eo ipso est donum, quo procedit a Patre et Filio,[5] et hoc facit ibi: *Ex praedictis patet, quod Spiritus sanctus sempiterne donum est*.

With all the other parts remaining undivided, because he prosecutes in a special manner the aforesaid questions, the middle or *second* part, which concerns the difference of “gift” and/or[4] “given”, has four parts. In the first he asks and determines, that the Holy Spirit is not for the same reason said (to be) a “gift” and a “given”, because He is a “gift” from eternity, but a “given” in time. However, in the second, contrary to this, that is that the Holy Spirit is eternally a gift, he objects, there (where he says): *But there is asked, to whom (is He) grantable, whether to the Father, and/or to the Son?* But, in the third, because he had spoken in the solution of a certain doubt, he for that reason moves and determines it incidentally, there (where he says): *Here there arises a question, if the Son by being born* etc.. However, in the fourth and last he returns to the first solution, showing, that the Holy Spirit is eternally a gift, because He is a gift for this, that He proceeds from the Father and the Son,[5] and

this he does there (where he says): *From the aforesaid it is clear, that the Holy Spirit is a gift sempiternally*.

TRACTATIO QUAESTIONUM.

Supposito ex praecedentibus, quod Spiritus sanctus sit donum et quod donetur, ad intelligentiam huius partis sex quaeruntur.

Primo quaeritur, utrum Spiritus sanctus sit donum, quo omnia alia dona donantur.

Secundo, utrum Spiritus sanctus sit[6] donum vel ab aeterno, vel ex tempore.

Tertio,[7] quid convenientius dicatur de Spiritu sancto, donum scilicet an datum.

Quarto, utrum donum proprie conveniat Spiritui sancto.

Quinto, utrum donum sit proprietas Spiritus sancti distinctiva.

Sexto, utrum ratione donabilitatis dicatur Spiritus sanctus[8] noster.

TREATMENT OF THE QUESTIONS

Having supposed from the aforesaid, that the Holy Spirit is a gift and that He is granted, there are asked, for an understanding of this part, six (questions):

First there is asked, whether the Holy Spirit is the Gift, whereby all other gives are granted.

Second, whether the Holy Spirit is[6] a gift either from eternity, and/or in time.

Third,[7] what is said more fittingly of the Holy Spirit, that is, “gift” or “given”.

Fourth, whether “gift” properly befits the Holy Spirit.

Fifth, whether “gift” is a distinctive property of the Holy Spirit.

Sixth, whether the Holy[8] Spirit is said to be “ours” by reason of (His) donability.

---

[1] In cod. B additur *omnia*.
[2] Vat. cum aliquibus mss. *quaeritur*.
[3] Cod. X *datur*.
[4] Ed. 1 cum uno alterove codice *et* loco *vel*.
[5] In sola Vat. additur *et quod temporaliter est datum vel donatum*, quod correspondet textui Magistri.
[6] Ex mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *sit*.
[7] Fide plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 expunximus additum *quaeritur*.
[8] Codd. S V omittunt *sanctus*, quae lectio concordat cum modo, quo haec quaestio infra ab omnibus mss. proponitur.

[1] In codex B there is added *all* [omnia].
[2] The Vatican edition, together with the other manuscripts, reads *there is asked* [quaertur].
[3] Codex X reads *is given* [datur].
[4] Edition 1 with one or the other codex has *and* [et] in place of *and/or* [vel].
[5] In the Vatican edition alone there is added *and that He is temporally a “given” and/or a “granted”*, which corresponds to the text of Master (Peter).
[6] From the manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *is* [sit].
[7] Trusting in the very many manuscripts and in edition 1, we have expunged the added *there is asked* [quaeritur].
[8] Codices S and V omits *Holy* [sanctus], which reading harmonizes with the manner, in which this question is proposed by all the manuscripts below.

---

p. 323

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

De proprietate Spiritus sancti, qua est donum.

QUAESTIO I.

Utrum Spiritus sanctus sit donum, in quo omnia alia dona donantur.

CIRCA PRIMUM, quod Spiritus sanctus sit donum, quo omnia alia dona[1] donantur, ostenditur *auctoritate* et *ratione*.

ARTICLE SOLE

On the property of the Holy Spirit, whereby His is a gift.

QUESTION 1

Whether the Holy Spirit is the Gift, in which all other gifts are granted.

ABOUT THE FIRST, that the Holy Spirit is the Gift, whereby all the other gifts[1] are granted, is shown *by authority* and *by*

reason.

1. *Auctoritate* sic: Apostolus primae ad Corinthios duodecimo:[2] *Divisiones gratiarum sunt, idem autem Spiritus, qui dividit singulis, prout vult*: et loquitur de donis non tantum gratiae gratum facientis, sed etiam quae sunt gratis datae: ergo si per Spiritum sanctum dantur utraque, cum non sit alia differentia donorum, ipse est donum, in quo omnia alia dona donantur.

1. *By authority* in this manner: The Apostle (says) in the twelfth (chapter) of the First (Letter) to the Corinthians:[2] *Divisions of graces there are, but the same Spirit, who divides to each one, as He wills*: and he speaks of gifts not only of the grace which makes one pleasing, but also (of those) which have been freely given: and if through the Holy Spirit each are given, since there is no other difference of gifts, He Himself is the Gift, in which all other gifts are granted.

2. Item, Augustinus decimo quinto de Trinitate:[3] « Per donum, quod est Spiritus sanctus, commune omnibus membris Christi, propria quibusque dona dividuntur ».

2. Likewise, (St.) Augustine in the fifteenth (book) On the Trinity (says):[3] « Through the Gift, which is the Holy Spirit, common to all the members of Christ, gifts proper to each are divided ».

3. Item, *ratione* ostenditur sic: Spiritus sanctus est primum donum, sed omne posterius ad prius reducitur: ergo omne donum reducitur ad donum, quod est Spiritus sanctus: ergo in omnibus donis ratio donationis est per Spiritum sanctum: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, it shown *by reason* in this manner: the Holy Spirit is the first Gift, but every posterior is lead back [reducitur] to the prior: therefore every gift is lead back to the Gift, which is the Holy Spirit: therefore in all gifts the reckoning of being granted [donationis] is through the Holy Spirit: ergo etc..

4. Item, omne donum, in quantum donum, ex amore datur, alioquin non habet rationem doni; sed « Spiritus sanctus est amor Patris et Filii », ut dicit Augustinus, et habitum est supra:[4] ergo etc.

4. Likewise, every gift, inasmuch as (it is) a gift, is given out of love [amore], otherwise it does not have the reckoning of a gift; but « the Holy Spirit is the Love of the Father and of the Son », as (St.) Augustine says, and as is had above:[4] ergo etc..

Contra: 1. Isidorus:[5] « Multis indignis Spiritu sancto dantur dona Spiritus sancti »: ergo contingit alia dona donari sine hoc: ergo non est donum, in quo omnia alia dona donantur.

On the contrary: 1. (St.) Isidore (of Seville says):[5] « To many unworthy of the Holy Spirit are the gifts of the Holy Spirit given »: therefore it happens that other gifts are given without Him. therefore He is not the Gift, in which all other gifts are given.

2. Item, aliqua sunt dona, quae appropriantur Filio, ut puta sunt illa quae dantur ad illustrationem intellectus: ergo si loquamur appropriate, talia dona donantur[6] in Filio sive per Filium, non dono, quod est Spiritus sanctus.

2. Likewise, there are some gifts, which are appropriated to the Son, as for example are those which are given for the illumination of the intellect [ad illustrationem intellectus]: therefore if we are to speak appropriately, such gifts are granted[6] in the Son or through the Son, not by the Gift, which is the Holy Spirit.

3. Item, Filius datus est nobis, Isaiae nono:[7] *Parvulus natus est nobis, Filius datus est nobis*: ergo si datur per Spiritum sanctum, videtur quod Spiritus sanctus aliquam auctoritatem vel influentiam habeat in Filium; hoc autem est falsum: ergo non

3. Likewise, the Son has been given to us, according to the ninth (chapter) of Isaiah:[7] *A little boy has been born for us, the Son has been given to us*: therefore if He is given through the Holy Spirit, it seems that the Holy Spirit has some authorship and/or

omnia alia dona donantur per Spiritum sanctum.

influence upon the Son; but this is false: therefore not all the other gifts are granted through the Holy Spirit.

4. Item, hoc ipsum[8] ostenditur per *impossibile*: esto quod intelligatur per impossibile, Spiritum sanctum non esse, adhuc Pater et Filius intelliguntur ut liberales, alioquin inest eis liberalitas a Spiritu sancto, quod falsum est: ergo si intelliguntur liberales, ergo et donatores.

4. Likewise, this very (thing)[8] is shown through the *impossible*: let it be that there is understood by way of the impossible, that the Holy Spirit is not, yet the Father and the Son are understood as liberal, (then) liberality is in Them in a manner other than from the Holy Spirit, which is false: therefore if They are understood (to be) liberal, therefore also as Grantors.

5. Item, si Spiritus Sanctus est donum, in quo alia dona donantur, ergo donum est doni et donationis[9] donatio, et si hoc, motus est motus et relationis relatio, et hoc habet Philosophus[10] pro inconvenienti. Cum enim dependens non possit alterum terminare, erit ibi processus in infinitum.

5. Likewise, if the Holy Spirit is a gift, in which the other gifts are granted, therefore a gift belongs to a gift and a being granted [donatio][9] to a being granted, and if this, a movement belongs to a movement and a relation to a relation, and this the Philosopher[10] holds as unfitting. For since the one dependent cannot terminate the other one, there will be a procession into infinity [infinitum].

CONCLUSIO.

Ista locutio, si ablativus in quo *sumitur in sensu concomitantiae, solummodo quoad dona gratuita vera est; si vero in sensu causalitatis, et quidem causae exemplaris, vera est quoad omnia dona.*

CONCLUSION

This saying, if "in which" *is taken in the sense of concomitance, is true only in regard to gratuitous gifts; but if in the sense of causality, and indeed of an exemplar cause, it is true in regard to all gifts.*

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod cum dicitur, quod Spiritus sanctus est donum, in quo omnia alia dona donantur, ablativus iste potest accipi dupliciter: vel ita, quod dicat *concomitantiam*, vel ita,[11] quod dicat *causalitatem*. Si dicat *concomitantiam*, sic intelligendo *univeraliter*, falsum est; quia est sensus, quod detur cum omnibus donis. Quaedam enim sunt dona, quae *semper* sunt cum Spiritu sancto, ut caritas et sapientia; quaedam, quae[12] *nunquam* sunt cum Spiritu sancto, ut timor servilis; quaedam, . . .

I respond: It must be said, that when it is said, that the Holy Spirit is the Gift, "in which" [in quo] all other gifts are granted, that ablative can be accepted in a twofold manner: either such, that it means a *concomitance*, and/or such,[11] that it means a *causality*. If it means *a concomitance*, thus understood *universally*, it is false; because the sense is, that He is given with all gifts. For there are certain gifts, which are *always* with the Holy Spirit, such as charity and wisdom; certain ones, which[12] are *never* with the Holy Spirit, as servile fear; certain ones, . . .

---

[1] In aliquibus codd. et Vat. deest hic et deinceps pluries in hac propositione *dona*.
[2] Vers. 4. et 11, ubi Vulgata *dividens* loco *qui dividit*. — Paulo ante Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 *et primo per Apostolum dicentem* pro *Auctoritate sic: Apostolus*.
[3] Cap. 19. n. 34: Per donum, quod est Spiritus sanctus, in commune omnibus membris Christi multa dona, quae sunt quibusque propria, dividuntur. — In quo textu Vat. cum cod. cc, refragantibus tamen antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1, loco *dividuntur* point *Dei donantur*.

[1] In some codices and in the Vatican edition there is lacking here and very often hereafter in this question *gifts* [dona].
[2] Verses 4 and 11, where the Vulgate has *dividing* [dividens] in place of *who divides* [qui dividit]. A little before this the Vatican edition, contrary to the manuscripts and to edition 1, has *and first through the Apostle saying* [et primo per Apostolum dicentem] for *By authority in this manner: Apostle* [Auctoritate sic: Apostolus].
[3] Chapter 19, n. 34: Through the Gift, which is the

[4] Dist. X in lit. Magistri, c. 1. et 2.
[5] Lib. I. Sent. sive de Summo bono, c. 15. n. 8: Aliquando non dignis et reprobis dona Spiritus sancti conferuntur. — Cod. Z cum ed. operum S. Isidori post *indignis* ponit *et reprobis*.
[6] Ed. 1 cum uno alterove codice *dantur*.
[7] Vers. 6.
[8] Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus *ipsum*.
[9] Fide mss. et ed. 1 expunximus additum *est*.
[10] Libr. V. Phys. text. 10-18. (c. 2.), et XI. Metaph. c. 11. (X. c. 12.), ubi inter cetera argumenta etiam istud habet, quod, si motus esset motus, statuendus esset progressus in infinitum, qui repugnat. Cfr. etiam I. Prior. c. 37. (c. 35). — Mox Vat. contra fere omnes codd. et ed. 1 incongrue *determinare* pro *terminare*.
[11] Ex vetustioribus mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 substituimus *ita* loco *sic*.
[12] Ed. 1 hic et paulo infra omittit *quae*. Mox cod. Z *non* et cod. V *autem non sunt* loco *sine*.

Holy Spirit, many gifts, which are proper to each, are divided to all the members of Christ in common. — In which text the Vatican, together with codex cc, yet breaking with the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, has *the many gifts of God, which are proper to each, are divided* etc. [quae sunt quibusque propria Dei dividuntur]
[4] Distinction X, in the text of Master (Peter), chs. 1 and 2.
[5] Sentences, Bk. I, or On the Highest Good, ch. 15, n. 8: Sometimes the gifts of the Holy Spirit are conferred upon the non-worthy and the reprobate. — Codex Z, together with the edition of the works of St. Isidore, has *unworthy of and reprobate by* [indignis et reprobis].
[6] Edition 1 together with one or the other codex reads *are given* [dantur].
[7] Verse 6.
[8] From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have inserted *very (thing)* [ipsum].
[9] Trusting in the manuscripts and in edition 1, we have expunged the added *belongs* [est].
[10] Physics, Bk. V, texts 10-18 (ch. 2), and Metaphysics, Bk .XI, ch. 11 (Bk. X, ch. 12), where among all the other arguments there is also had this one, that, if a movement belongs to a movement, one that is to stand still belongs to a progression unto infinity, which he reproves. Cf. also Prior Analytics, Bk. I, ch. 37 (ch. 35). — Next the Vatican edition, contrary to nearly all the codices and to edition 1, incongruously has *determine* [determinare] for *terminate* [terminare].
[11] From the older manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3 and 6, we have substituted *such* [ita] in place of *thus* [sic].
[12] Edition 1 here and a little below this omits *which* [quae]. Next codex Z has *not even* [non et] and codex V *however they are not* [autem non sunt] in place of *without* [sine].

---

quae *aliquando* sunt cum Spiritu sancto, *aliquando* sine, ut fides, prophetia et huiusmodi.
Si autem *particulariter* intelligatur de donis gratiae gratum facientis,[1] sic vera est et non habet instantiam.

Potest iterum abalativus iste[2] importare *causalitatem*, et hoc tripliciter: vel ita, quod dicat *simpliciter* causalitatem, et in hoc non distinguitur nec a Patre nec a Filio, quia omnia dona sunt a Patre et a Filio, ut[3] a Spiritu sancto; vel ita, ut dicat *causalitatem et suauctoritatem*, et in hoc distinguitur a Patre, sed non a Filio, quia Pater et per Filium et per Spiritum sanctum donat; vel ita, ut[4] dicat *causalitatem et subauctoritatem et exemplaritatem*, et sic

which *sometimes* are with the Holy Spirit, *sometimes* without, such as faith, prophecy and (gifts) of this kind.
But if it be understood *particularly* of the gifts of grace which make one pleasing,[1] in this manner (the concomitance) is true and does not have opposition [instantiam].

Again this[2] ablative can convey *causality*, and this in a threefold manner: either such, that is means *simply* causality, and in this He is not distinguished neither from the Father nor from the Son, because all gifts are from the Father and from the Son, as[3] (they are) from the Holy Spirit; and/or such, that it means *causality and subauthorship*, and in this He is distinguished from the Father, but not from the Son, because the Father grants (gifts) both through the Son

proprie Spiritui sancto convenit. Ipse enim procedit per modum primi doni, ita quod omnis donatio recta et gratuita post illam est ab illa accipit rationem donationis. Concedendum est ergo, quod Spiritus sanctus est donum, quo omnia dona, scilicet gratuita, donantur per concomitantiam, et quo *omnia* Dei dona donantur per *exemplaritatis* causam.

and through the Holy Spirit; and/or such, that[4] it means *causality and subauthority and exemplarity*, and thus it does properly befit the Holy Spirit. For He Himself proceeds through the manner of a first gift, such that every right and gratuitous donation is after that one and accepts a reckoning of donation from that one. It must be conceded, therefore, that the Holy Spirit is the Gift, whereby all gifts, that is, gratuitous ones, are granted through concomitance, and whereby *all* the gifts of God are granted through the Cause of *exemplarity*.

1. Ad illud ergo[5] quod obiicitur primo de Isidoro, iam patet responsio, quod ipse loquitur de donis gratiae gratis datae, non gratum facientis.

1. To that, therefore,[5] which is objected first from (St.) Isidore, the response is already clear, because he speaks of the gifts of the grace freely given, not (of the grace) which makes one pleasing.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur secundo, quod quaedam dona approprianturFilio; dicendum, quod de donis est loqui dupliciter: aut ratione *eius quod subest*, aut sub[6] ratione *donationis*. Ratione *eius quod subest* aliqua dona appropriantur Filio, ut sapientia et intelligentia, aliqua Spiritui sancto, ut caritas. Ratione vero *donationis*, omnia appropriantur Spiritui sancto ratione iam dicta,[7] quia per ipsum tanquam per primum donum donantur alia.

2. To that which is objected second, that certain gifts are appropriated to the Son; it must be said, that of gifts there is a twofold manner of speaking [loqui dupliciter]: either by the reckoning *of that which is under* [subest], or under[6] the reckoning *of a donation*. By the reckoning *of that which is under* some gifts are appropriated to the Son, as wisdom and understanding (are), some to the Holy Spirit, as charity (is). However by the reckoning *of donation*, all are appropriated to the Holy Spirit for the reason already said,[7] because through Him as through the First Gift, the others are granted.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod Filius est datus, et non a Spiritu sancto; responderi potest, quod Filius est datus secundum humanam naturam, et hoc fuit per amorem, Ioannis tertio:[8] *Sic Deus dilexit mundum, ut Filium suum unigenitum daret*.

3. To that which is objected, that the Son has been given, and not by the Holy Sprit, it can be responded, that the Son has been given according to (His) Human Nature, and this was through love, according to the third (chapter of the Gospel of St.) John:[8] *Thus has God loved the world, that He gave His own, Only-Begotten Son*.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod, Spiritu sancto circumscripto, adhuc manet ratio doni; dicendum, quod, circumscripto Spiritu sancto, est intelligere in Deo donorum causalitatem et subauctoritatem, sed non exemplaritatem donationis sub ratione donationis, quia non intelligitur processus amoris; et hoc ultimo modo dicitur proprie convenire Spiritui sancto.

4. To that which is objected, that, with the Holy Spirit excluded [circumscripto], there still remains the reckoning of a gift; it must be said, that, with the Holy Spirit excluded, there is an understanding of a causality and subauthority of gifts in God, but not an exemplarity of donation under the reckoning of donation, because the process of love is not understood; and in this last manner it is properly said to befit the Holy Spirit.

5. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod tunc est

5. To that which is objected, that then there

donum doni; dicendum, quod motus non est motus, ut *termini*, similiter nec relationis relatio; tamen ut *principii* et[9] motus est motus, quia motus est principium motus, et relatio relationis; et sic dicitur donum doni. Et quia in causando statur in primo, cum sit primum donum, non est abire in infinitum. *Praeterea*, donum in divinis veram hypostasim dicit.

is a gift of a gift, it must be said, that a movement does not belong to a movement, as *to a terminus*, similarly neither a relation to a relation; yet as *to a principle* and[9] to a movement a movement does belong, because a movement is a principle of a movement, and a relation of a relation; and in this manner there is said a gift (belongs to) a Gift. And because in causing one stands still in the first, since He is the First Gift, there is no infinite regression [abire in infinitum]. *Besides*, a "gift" among the divine means a true Hypostasis.

SCHOLION.

I. De hoc nomine *doni*, quod est proprium Spiritui sancto, Seraphicus uberius prae omnibus antiquis magistris in tota hac distinctione loquitur. — Propositio, quod Spiritus sanctus sit donum, in quo omnia alia dona donantur, si verba: *omnia dona* universaliter sumuntur, in sensu falso potest intelligi, cum quaedam sint dona, quae quidem donantur *per* Spiritum sanctum, sed non *cum* Spiritu sancto. Nam Concilium Tridentinum dicit (Sess. 14. c. 4. de contritione): « Timorem esse quidem donum Dei, non tamen inhabitantis Spiritus sancti, sed impellentis ». Si S. Doctor affirmat, timorem servilem nunquam esse». cum Spiritu sancto, intelligit timorem serviliter servilem, qui non potest stare cum gratia sanctificatione, bene vero timor simpliciter servilis, sicut et spes, quod constat ex Tridentino (Sess. 6. cap. 9.). De timore eiusque speciebus videsis III. Sent. d. 15. dub. 3, et d. 34. p. II. a. 1. et 2.

II. Pro explicatione solutionis ad 5. servire possunt verba Richardi (hic q. 5. ad. 2.): « Quamvis motus non principiet alium motum ut *proprium* eius terminum et immediatum, tamen certum est, quod per unum motum causatur alius. Et longe in infinitum fortius per donum aeternum, quod est res subsistens, potest immediate causari donum creatum ». Eodem fere modo hanc obiectionem solvunt S. Thom. (hic. q. 1. a. 3.); B. Albert. (hic a. 1. ad 1.); Petr. a Tar. (hic q. 3. a. 1. ad 6.).

III. Praeter iam nominatos auctores cfr. Alex.

SCHOLIUM

I. Of this name "gift", which is proper to the Holy Spirit, the Seraphic (Doctor) speaks more abundantly than all the ancient masters on this entire distinction. — The proposition, that the Holy Spirit is the Gift, in which all other gifts are granted, if the words "all gifts" are taken universally, can be understood in a false sense, since there are certain gifts, which indeed are granted *through* the Holy Spirit, but not *with* the Holy Spirit. For the Council of Trent says (Session 14, ch. 4, "On Contrition"): « That fear is indeed a gift of God, yet not of the Holy Spirit indwelling, but of Him impelling ». If the Seraphic Doctor affirms, that servile fear is never with the Holy Spirit, he understands "servile fear" in a servile sense, which cannot stand with sanctifying grace, but (rather) the properly, simply servile fear, just as also the hope, which is established from Trent (Session 6, chapter 9). On the fear and its species, see <u>Sent</u>., Bk. III, d. 15, dubium 5, and d. 34, p. II, articles 1 and 2.

II. For an explanation of the solution to n. 5 there can serve the words of Richard (of Middleton), here in q. 5, in reply to n. 2: « Although a movement does not begin another movement as its *proper* and immediate terminus, yet it is certain, that through one movement another is caused. And far from ad infinitum, through an eternal Gift, which is a subsisting thing, a created gift can be immediately caused ». In nearly the same manner St. Thomas solves this objection, here in q. 1, a. 3; Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 1, in reply to n. 1; (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 3, a. 1, in reply to n. 6.

III. Besides the authors already mentioned,

Hal., S. p. I. q. 64. m. 1. — S. Thom., loc. cit. et S.c. Gent. IV. c. 21. — Aegid. R., hic 1. princ. q. 3. — Henr. Gand., S. a 61. q. 2. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 1.

cf. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 64, m. 1. — St. Thomas, loc. cit. and Summa contra Gentiles, Bk. IV, ch. 21. — Giles the Roman, here in 1st. princ., q. 3. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 61, q. 2. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 1.

---

[1] Vat. cum cod. cc praeter fidem antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 *donis gratum facientibus*. Mox cod. X *verum* pro *vera*, scil. proposita illa: Spiritus sanctus est donum in quo etc.
[2] In Vat. deest *iste*, quod tamen in mss. (in pluribus *ille*) et ed. 1 habetur.
[3] Auctoritate plurimorum mss. posuimus *ut* pro minus distinctio *et*, loco cuius ed. 1 *sicut* habet.
[4] Aliqui codd. ut V X cum ed. 1 *quod*.
[5] Ex multis mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *ergo*. Paulo infra nonnulli codd. ut H K Z cum ed. 1 *quia ipse* pro *quid ipse*.
[6] In cod. V deest *sub*. Mox post *Ratione* cum cod. Z et ed. 1 omisimus *vero*, quod multi cod. cum Vat. habent. Paulo infra in cod. X post *aliqua* repetitur *approprientur*.
[7] In corp. quaest. circa finem. Mox cod. O omittit *alia*.
[8] Vers. 16.
[9] In cod. O deficit *et*.

[1] The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, not trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and in edition 1, reads *of the gifts making one pleasing* [de donis gratum facientibus]. Next codex X has *it is true* [verum est] for *(the concomitance) is true* [vera est]: *it* referring to the entire proposition: *the Holy Spirit is the Gift, in which* etc..
[2] In the Vatican edition there is lacking *this* [iste], which however is had in the manuscripts (in very many as *that* [ille]) and in edition 1. [Trans. note: here *this* refers to the "*in which*" of the proposition *that the Holy Spirit is the Gift in which all the other gifts are granted*.]
[3] On the authority of very many manuscripts, we have put *as (they are)* [ut] for the less distinct *and* [et], in place of which edition 1 has *just as* [sicut].
[4] Some codices, such as V and X, together with edition 1, read *that* [quod] for *that* [ut].
[5] From many manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *therefore* [ergo].
[6] In codex X there is lacking *under* [sub]. Next after *By the reckoning* [Ratione], we have, together with codex Z and edition 1, omitted the *however* [vero], which many codices together with the Vatican edition have. A little below this in codex X after *some* [aliqua] there is repeated *are appropriated* [appropriantur].
[7] In the body of the question, near the end. Next codex O omits *the others* [alia].
[8] Verse 16.
[9] In codex O there is lacking *and* [et].

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVIII.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio II.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 325-326.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVIII

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 2

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 325-326.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO II.

Utrum Spiritus sanctus sit donum ab aeterno, an ex tempore.

Secundo quaeritur, utrum Spiritus sanctus sit donum ab aeterno, vel ex tempore. Et quod ex tempore, videtur.

1. Augustinus decimo quinto de Trinitate:[1] « Eo donum est, quod datur quibus datur »; sed datur ex tempore: ergo etc.

2. Item, quinto de Trinitate:[2] « Eo donum dicitur, quod daturus ipsum erat Deus »; sed constat, quod daturus erat ex tempore: ergo si donum est aeternum, temporale est causa aeterni.

3. Item, hoc[3] videtur per *rationem*. Donum enim non tantum dicit comparationem ad dantem, sed etiam ad eum cui datur: ergo posito *dono*, ponitur *dans* et *recipiens*, quia relatio ponit extrema;[4] sed recipiens est creatura: ergo etc.

4. Item, donum addit supra datum, quia « donum est datio irreddibilis »:[5] ergo si Spiritus sanctus non est datus nisi ex tempore, nec est donum nisi ex tempore.

5. Item, sicut Filii est generari, ita doni est donari; sed non est Filius, antequam generetur: ergo nec donum, antequam donetur; sed donatur tantum ex tempore: ergo etc.

Contra: 1. Augustinus quinto de Trinitate:[6] « Quia Spiritus procedebat, ut esset donabilis, iam donum erat »; sed

QUESTION 2

Whether the Holy Spirit is the a gift from eternity, or in time.

Second there is asked, whether the Holy Spirit is a gift from eternity, and/or in time [ex tempore]. And it seems that (He is such) in time:

1. (St.) Augustine in the fifteenth (chapter) <u>On the Trinity</u> (says):[1] « He is a gift for this, that He is given to those to whom He is given »; but He is given in time: ergo etc..

2. Likewise, (he says) in the fifth (chapter) <u>On the Trinity</u>:[2] « He is said (to be) a "gift" for this, that God was going to give Him »; but it is established, that He was going to give Him in time: therefore if He is an eternal "gift", the temporal is the cause of the eternal.

3. Likewise, this[3] seems through *reason*. For "gift" not only means a comparison to the one giving, but also to him to whom it is given: therefore having posited a "gift", there is posited *one giving* and *one receiving*, because a relation posits (its) extremes;[4] but the one receiving is a creature: ergo etc..

4. Likewise, "gift" adds upon "given", because « a gift is a un-returnable giving »:[5] therefore if the Holy Spirit has not been given except in time, neither is He a gift except in time.

5. Likewise, just as to the Son it belongs to be generated, so to a gift to be granted; but there is no Son, before He is generated: therefore neither a gift, before it is granted; but He is granted in time: ergo etc..

On the contrary: 1. (St.) Augustine (says) in the fifth (chapter) <u>On the Trinity</u>:[6] « Because the Spirit was proceeding, to be

procedere ut donabile, hoc est aeternum: ergo et donum ab aeterno.

grantable, He already was a gift »; but "that He proceeds as a grantable", this is eternal: therefore (He is) also a "gift" from eternity.

2. Item, ibidem expressius:[7] « Spiritus sanctus sempiterne donum est, temporaliter vero datur ».

2. Likewise, in the same place (he says) more expressly:[7] « The Holy Spirit is sempiternally the Gift, however temporally He is given ».

3. Item, hoc ipsum videtur *ratione*, quia ubi est amor gratuitus, ibi est ratio[8] doni; sed ab aeterno est in Deo ponere amorem gratuitum: ergo et donum.

3. Likewise, this very (thing) seems *by reason*, because where there is gratuitous love, there is a reckoning[8] of a gift; but from eternity there is in God a positing of gratuitous love: therefore also of a gift.

4. Item, ubi est perfecta ratio liberalitatis, ibi est donum; sed in divinis ab aeterno est perfecta ratio liberalitatis: ergo etc.

4. Likewise, where there is a perfect reckoning of liberality, there is a gift; but among the divine there is from eternity a perfect reckoning of liberality: ergo etc..

5. Item, sicut se habet ratio verbi ad rerum productionem, sic se habet ratio doni ad gratiarum distributionem;[9] sed ante rerum productionem in principio fuit Verbum: ergo ante gratiarum collationem in principio fuit Donum.

5. Likewise, just as the reckoning of a "word" holds itself to the production of things, so the reckoning of a "gift" to the distribution[9] of graces; but before the production of things at the beginning there was the Word; therefore before the conferral of graces at the beginning was the Gift.

CONCLUSIO.

Donum ut datum dicitur temporaliter; donum vero ut aliquando donandum vel ut donabile dicitur aeternaliter.

CONCLUSION

"Gift" as a "given" is said temporally; however, "gift" as a "sometimes to be given" and/or as a "grantable" is said eternally.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod cum donum dicat respectum ad eum cui datur, hoc potest esse tripliciter: vel secundum *actum*, vel secundum *habitum*,[10] vel secundum *aptitudinem*. Si secundum *actum*, hoc modo dicitur donum, quia datur; si secundum *habitum*, hoc modo dicitur donum, quia donandum aliquando; si secundum *aptitudinem*, hoc modo dicitur donum, quia donabile.

I respond: It must be said, that since "gift" means a looking-back to him to whom it is given, this can be in a threefold manner: either according to *act*, and/or according to *habit*,[10] and/or according to *aptitude*. If according to *act*, in this manner "gift" is meant, because it is given; if according to *habit*, in this manner "gift" is meant, because sometimes (it is) to be given; if according to *aptitude*, in this manner "gift" is meant, because (it is) grantable.

Secundum primam acceptationem dicitur temporaliter; sed secundum secundam et tertiam dicitur aeternaliter. Et in his tribus sensibus accipit Augustinus. Concedendum est ergo, quod secundum aliquam acceptionem donum[11] dicitur aeternaliter, sicut probant rationes inductae ad secundam partem.

According to the first acceptation it is said temporally; but according to the second and third it is said eternally. And in these three senses does (St.) Augustine accept it. It must be conceded, therefore, that according to any acceptation He is said (to be) a "gift"[11] eternally, just as the reasons brought forward for the second part prove.

1. Ad illud vero quod obiicitur in contrarium, dicendum, quod procedit de dono, ut dicit *actum* donationis, et sic ex tempore dicitur;

1. To that, however, which is objected in the Contrary, it must be said, that it proceeds from "gift", such as it means the *act* of the

unde non valet obiectio.

donation, and thus is meant in time; wherefore the objection is not valid.

2. Ad illud quod secundo obiicitur, quod eo dicitur donum, quo daturus etc.; dicendum, quod secundum istam acceptationem dicitur aeternaliter, quia non dicit respectum ad creaturam secundum *actum*, sed secundum *habitum*, sicut et praedestinatio.

2. To that which is objected second, that He is said (to be) a "gift" for this, that He was going to be given etc.; it must be said, that according to that acceptation He is said (to be a "gift") eternally, because (that acceptation) does not mean a looking-back to the creature according to *act*, but according to *habit*, just as even predestination (does).

Quod ergo obiicitur, quod tunc temporale est causa aeterni; dicendum, quod illud participium *daturus* duo importat, videlicet ordinationem ad dandum et actum[12] ordinationis; et ordinatio est aeterna, licet actus sit temporalis; et tunc ablativus non dicit causalitatem ratione actus, sed ratione ordinationis.

What, therefore, is objected, that then the temporal is the cause of the eternal ; it must be said, that that participle *going to give* [daturus] conveys two (things), namely "an ordination to the one going to give" and "the act[12] of ordination"; and the ordination is eternal, though the act is temporal; and then the ablative does not mean a causality by a reckoning of act, but by a reckoning of the ordination.

---

[1] Cap. 19. n. 36. Vide in lit. Magistri, c. 2. in princ.
[2] Cap. 15. n. 16. Cfr. lit. Magistri, c. 2. circa finem.
[3] Fide vetustiorum mss. et ed. 1 adiuximus *hoc*.
[4] Cod. I *utrumque extremum*, uti et infra in resp. ad hanc obiectionem habetur.
[5] Aristot., IV. Topic. c. 4. — Sensus est: donum est datio liberalis, quae fit sine intentione retributionis.
[6] Cap. 15. n. 16; vide hic lit. Magistri, c. 2. circa medium.
[7] Cap. 16. n. 17. Cfr. lit. Magistri, c. 2 circa medium. — Sequimur plurimos codd. cum ed. 1, substituendo *ibidem* pro *idem*.
[8] Vat. cum cod. cc incongrue *gratia* pro *ratio*.
[9] Cod. X hic sicut in immediate sequentibus *collationem*.
[10] Licet mss. cum sex primis edd. ponat hic et paulo infra *habitudinem* loco *habitum*, praeferimus tamen lectionem Vat., tum quia nomen *habitudo* communiter a S. Doctore in alio sensu (cfr. infra q. 6.) accipitur, tum quia in sequentibus (excepta res. ad 3, in qua multi codd. *habitudinalis* loco *habitualis* exbhibent), praesertim q. 5, omnes codd. ponunt *habitum*. Quod attinet ad rem, notes, quod in hoc distinctionis membro respectu doni insinuetur specialis determinatio, quae infra ad 2 vocatur *ordinatio*, per quam constituatur in ratione futuri et ab aliis membris distinguatur.
[11] Vat. cum cod. cc contra antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 addit *Dei*.
[12] Intellige: exsecutionem.

---

[1] Chapter 19, n. 36. See the text of Master (Peter), ch. 2, at the beginning.
[2] Chapter 15, n. 16. Cf. the text of Master (Peter), ch. 2, near the end.
[3] Trusting in the older manuscripts and edition 1, we have inserted *this* [hoc].
[4] Codex I *each extreme* [utrumque extremum], as is also had below in the response to this objection.
[5] Aristotle, Topics, Bk. IV, ch. 4. — The sense is: a "gift" is a "liberal giving", which comes to be without the intention of a retribution.
[6] Chapter 15, n. 16; see here the text of Master (Peter), ch. 2, near the middle.
[7] Chapter 16, n. 17. Cf. the text of Master (Peter), ch. 2, near the middle. — We follow the very many codices, together with edition 1, by substituting *in the same place* [ibidem] for *the same* [idem].
[8] The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, incongruously has *a grace* [gratia] for *a reckoning* [ratio].
[9] Codex X here, as in the immediately following propositions, reads *conferral* [collationem].
[10] Though the manuscripts, together with six first editions, put here, and a little below this, *habitude* [habitudinem] in place of *habit* [habitum], we, however, prefer the reading of the Vatican edition, both because the noun *habitude* [habitudo] is commonly accepted by the Seraphic Doctor in another sense (cfr. below a. 6), as because in the following propositions (except response to n. 3, in which many codices exhibit *habitudinal* [habitudinalis] in place of *habitual* [habitualis]), especially in q. 5, all the codices have *habit* [habitum]. Which touches upon the subject, you may notice, because in this member of the distinction in respect to the gift there is hinted at a special determination, which below in reply to n. 2 is called *ordination* [ordinatio], through which it is

constituted in the reckoning of the future and is distinguished from the other members.

[11] The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, contrary to the more ancient codices and edition 1, adds *of God* [Dei].

[12] Understand: *the execution* of the ordination.

Posset tamen dici, quod[1] dicit causam consequentiae, non consequentis.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod dicit relationem ad extrema; dicendum, quod relatio actualis ponit utrumque extremum in actu, non autem relatio habitualis,[2] sicut patet, quod Deus aeternaliter dicitur exemplar creaturae temporalis.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod donum addit supra datum; dicendum, quod *donum* in quibusdam consequitur rationem *dati*, ut puta sunt illa quae de se non dicunt liberalitatem, nisi prout additur eis ratio communicationis, ut liber, cultellus et huiusmodi. In aliquo *datum* consequitur rationem *doni*, ut puta in eo quod ex se importat liberalitatem, etiamsi nunquam detur donum,[3] ut est amor: et sic convenit Spiritui sancto.

5. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod sicut Filii est generari etc.; dicendum, quod falsum est, quia *generari* dicit emanationem Filii, quae secundum rationem intelligendi praecedit Filium; unde impossibile est, quod sit, nisi generetur; *donari* autem non solum dicit doni emanationem, sed amplius dicit eius commmunicationem, et hoc consequitur esse doni, et ideo non dicitur donum ex tempore, quamvis donetur ex tempore.

SCHOLION.

I. Quoad sensum quaestionis notandum, quod differunt hae locutiones: esse *ex* tempore, esse *cum* tempore, esse *in* tempore. Primum significat, ipsum *esse* habere initium, et dicitur de omnibus creatis, secundum vero, aliquod ens coexistere tempori, quod etiam de Deo dici potest; tertium autem, aliquid mensuari tempore, quod proprie dicitur

Yet it can be said, that it[1] means a cause of consequence, not of the consequent.

3. To that which is objected, that it means a relation to extremes; it must be said, that an actual relation posits each extreme in act, but a habitual relation[2] (does) not, just as it is clear, that God is said (to be) eternally the Exemplar of the temporal creature.

4. To that which is objected, that "gift" adds above "given"; it must be said, that "*gift*" in certain (things) is consequent to the reckoning of a "*given*", as for example are those which of themselves do not mean liberality, except insofar as there is added to them a reckoning of communication, such as book, a small knife [cultellus] and (things) of this kind. In something a "*given*" is consequent to the reckoning of a "*gift*", as for example in that which of itself conveys liberality, even if "gift"[3] is never given, such as love is: and in this manner it befits the Holy Spirit.

5. To that which is objected, that just as to the Son it belongs to be generated etc.; it must be said, that it is false, because *to be generated* means the emanation of the Son, which according to the reckoning of understanding precedes the Son; whence it is impossible, that He be, unless He is generated; but *to be granted* does not only mean the emanation of a gift, but means more fully its communication, and this is consequence to the "being" of a gift, and for that reason He is not said (to be) a "gift" in time, though He is granted in time.

SCHOLIUM

I. In regard to the sense of the question it must be noted, that these sayings differ: "to be in time" [ex tempore], "to be with time" [cum tempore], "to be in a time" [in tempore]. The first signifies, that the "*being*" has a start, and is said of all created things; however, the second, that some being is coexistent to time, which can even be said of God, but the third, that something

corruptibilibus.

II. Triplex conclusio eruitur ex hoc fundamento, quod donum dicit respectum ad eum cui datur, et quod hic respectus potest esse triplex. Secundus et tertius respectus, qui est tantum secundum ratione, non est relatio in *actu*, quae semper ponit etiam extrema sua in actu, sed relatio in *habitu* vel in *aptitudine*, ut bene explicatur in solut. ad 2. et 3. In re principali omnes magistri consentiunt. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 64. m. 2. — B. Albert., hic a. 6; S. p. I. tr. 8. q. 36. m. 2 partic. 2. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 2. a. 2. quaestiunc. 1. — Richard. a Med., hic q. 4. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 59. q. 5. n. 32. seqq. — Dionys. Carth., de hac et seqq. tribus hic q. 2. circa finem. — Biel, de hac et tribus seqq. hic a. unica.

is measured by time, which properly is said of corruptibles.

II. The threefold conclusion is build upon this fundament, that a "gift" means a looking-back to him to whom it is given, and that this looking-back can be threefold. The second and third of which, which is only according to a reckoning, is not a relation in *act*, which always posits even its own extremes in act, but a relation in *habit* and/or *aptitude*, as is better explained in solution to nn. 2 and 3. In the principal matter all the Masters agree. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 64, m. 2. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Ma gnus), here in a. 6; Summa., p. I, tr. 8, q. 36, m. 2, partic. 2. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 2, a. 2, quaestiunc. 1. — Richard of Middleton, here in q. 4. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 59, q. 5, n. 32. ff. — (Bl.) Dionysius Carthusian, on this and the following 3 questions, herein q. 2., near the end. — (Gabriel) Biel, on this and the following 3 questions here in article sole.

---

[1] Subaudi: ablativus ille *eo quo*. De distinctione *consequentia* et *consequentis* cfr. infra d. 38. a. 2. q. 1. in corp. et alibi passim. — Explicationem huius solutionis accipe a B. Alberto, hic a. 6. ad 4: Dicendum, quod est causalitas consequentiae et non consequentis, et sic bene effectus infert causam; et est causalitas consequentis, et sic non infert effectus causam, sed magis e converso, et sic est hic; unde quando ex temporali infertur aeternum, non est nisi ratio, consequentiae et non consequentis.

[2] Plurimi codd. cum ed. 1 *habitudinalis*; aliqui ut F H P Q X *habitualis*; Vat. cum edd. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, *habitu*. Vide supra in corp. quaest.

[3] Vat. contra mss. et sex primas edd. *dono*. Mox post *sic* cod. M addit *donum*.

[1] Understand: that ablative *for this that* [eo quod]. On the distinction of *consequence* and *of the consequent* cf. below d. 38, a. 2, q. 1 in the body, and elsewhere in passing. — The explanation of this solution is given by Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 6, in reply to n. 4: It must be said, that it is a causality of consequence and not of the consequent, and in this manner an effect does indeed infer the cause; and there is the causality of the consequent, and in this manner an effect does not infer the cause, but rather the other way around, and in this manner is this; wherefore when from a temporal there is inferred the eternal, there is not but a reckoning, of consequence and not of the consequent.

[2] Very many codices together with edition 1 have *habitudinal* [habitudinalis], some, such as F H P Q X, have *habitual* [habitualis], the Vatican edition, together with editions 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, has *a relation according to habit* [habitu relatio]. See above in the body of the question.

[3] The Vatican edition, contrary to the manuscripts and six first editions, reads *even if it is never given as a gift* [etiamsi nunquam detur dono] . Next after *in this manner* [sic] codex M adds *"gift"* [donum] for the subject of the verb.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVIII.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio III.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 326-327.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

QUAESTIO III.

Utrum convenientius de Spiritu sancto dicatur donum quam datum.

Tertio quaeritur, utrum convenientius de Spiritu sancto dicatur donum quam datum. Et quod tam convenienter dicatur datum ut[4] donum, videtur:

1. Quia Iacobi primo:[5] *Omne datum optimum et omne donum perfectum desursum est*; ergo a Spiritu sancto ita sunt data, sicut et dona: ergo sicut ad ipsum transfertur ratio doni, ita et dati.

2. Item, mobilis et moti est eadem ratio,[6] ergo similiter dati et donabilis: ergo si donum dicitur in ratione donabilis, datum vero in ratione actualiter dati, ergo eadem est ratio doni et dati, ergo etc.

3. Item, in quolibet genere perfectior est actus quam potentia:[7] ergo cum datum dicat in actu, donum in potentia, perfectius

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVIII

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 3

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 326-327.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUESTION 3

Whether there is more fittingly said of the Holy Spirit “gift” than “given”.

Third there is asked, whether there is more fittingly said of the Holy Spirit “gift” than “given”. And it seems that “given” is said as fittingly as[4] “gift”:

1. Because in the first (chapter of the Letter of St.) James (there is written):[5] *Every best given and every perfect gift is from above*; therefore by the Holy Spirit there are thus “givens”, just as “gifts”: therefore just as to Him there is transferred the reckoning of a gift, so also of a given.

2. Likewise, of the mobile and the moved there is the same reckoning,[6] therefore similarly of the given and the grantable: therefore if “gift” is said in the reckoning of the grantable, but “given” in the reckoning of the actually “given”, therefore the same is the reckoning of “gift” and of “given”, ergo etc..

3. Likewise, in every genus act is more perfect than potency:[7] therefore, since “given” means “in act”, “gift” “in potency”,

exprimitur aliquid cum dicitur datum quam donum; sed quod maioris est perfectionis magis proprie convenit Deo: ergo etc.

something is more perfectly expressed when there is said "given" than "gift"; but what is of a greater perfection more properly befits God: ergo etc..

4. Item, quando aliqua duo dicuntur de aliquo, quorum unum est ratio dicendi alterum de eodem, illud convenientius dicitur, quod est ratio dicendi;[8] sed datum et donum dicuntur de Spiritu sancto, et ut vult Augustinus,[9] « eo donum dicitur, quia datur »: ergo magis proprie dicitur datum.

4. Likewise, when any two are said of something, the one of which is the reason for saying the other of the same, that is more fittingly said, which is the reason for saying;[8] but "given" and "gift" are said of the Holy Spirit, and as (St.) Augustine would have it [vult],[9] « He is said (to be) a "gift" for this, that He is given »: therefore He is more properly said (to be) a "given".

Contra: 1. *Datum* convenit Spiritui sancto solum . . .

On the contrary: 1. "*Given*" befits the Holy Spirit only . . .

[4] Cod. X *quam* loco *ut*.
[5] Vers. 17. — Paulo infra post *sancto* ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *ita*, quod Vat. cum cod. cc minus bene omittit.
[6] B. Albert., hic a. 2 eandem propos. ita exhibet: Mobilis et moti una ratio substantiae est, non differens nisi per actum et potentiam. — Paulo post nonnulli codd. ut T V *dicit* pro *dicitur*. Dein Vat. cum cod. cc minus apte et praeter fidem aliorum codd. cum ed. 1 *actualitatis* pro *actualiter*.
[7] Cfr. Aristot., IX. Metaph. text. 15. (VIII. c. 8.), ubi probatur, actum esse priorem substantia (i. e. perfectione) quam potentia.
[8] Simile est dictum Aristot., I. Poster. c. 2: Propter quod est unumquodque, et illud magis. Et II. Metaph. text. 4. (I. brev. c. 1.): Unumquodque vero idipsum maxime aliorum est, secundum quod aliis univocatio inest. — Mox fide et ed. 4 substituimus *dicuntur* loco *dicitur*.
[9] Libr. XV. de Trin. c. 19. n. 36; vide hic lit. Magistri, c. 2.

[4] Codex X has *as* [quam] in place of *as* [ut].
[5] Verse 17. — A little below this after *Holy Spirit* [Spiritu sancto], we have supplied from the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, *thus* [ita], which the Vatican edition, together with codex cc, has less well omitted.
[6] Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 2 exhibits the same proposition, thus: Of the mobile and the moved there is one reckoning of substance, not differing except through act and potency. — A little after this not a few codices, such as T and V, have *means* [dicit] for *is said* [dicitur]. Then the Vatican edition, together with codex cc, less aptly, and not trusting in the other codices together with edition 1, has *of the actuality of the "given"* [actualitatis dati].
[7] Cf. Aristotle, Metaphyiscs, Bk. IX, text 15 (Bk. VIII, ch. 8), where there is proven, that act is according to substance (i. e. according to perfection) before potency.
[8] Similar is the saying of Aristotle, Posterior Analytics., Bk. II, ch. 2: That on account of which each one is, (is itself) also more. And Metaphysics, Bk. II, text 4 (Bk. I in the shorter version, ch. 1): But each one itself most of all belongs to the others, according to which there is a univocity in the others. Next, trusting in edition 4, we have also substituted *are said* [dicunutr] for *is said* [dicitur].
[9] On the Trinity, Bk. XV, ch. 19, n. 36; see the text of Master (Peter) here in ch. 2.

---

ex tempore, sed *donum* aeternaliter: ergo magis proprie dicitur donum.

2. Item, si nunquam actu daretur, donum esset et spiritus esset: ergo videtur, quod magis proprie convenit ei donum.[1]

3. Item, Glossa super illud Iacobi primo:[2] *Omne datum optimum* etc. dicit, quod « datum dicitur quoad naturalia, donum

in time, but "gift" eternally: therefore He is more properly said (to be) a "gift".

2. Likewise, even if He were never given by an act, He would be "gift" and "spirit": therefore it seems, that "gift" more properly befits Him.

3. Likewise, the Gloss on that (verse) in the first (chapter of the Letter of St.) James:[2] *Every best given* etc., says that « "given" is

quoad gratuita ». Si ergo gratuita aptius appropirantur Spiritui sancto, qui sanctificat, quam naturalia: ergo melius in divinis dicitur de Spiritu sancto donum quam datum.

said in regard to natural (gifts), "gift" in regard to gratuitous ones ». If, therefore, the gratuitous are more aptly appropriated to the Holy Spirit, who sanctifies, than the natural ones: therefore among the divine "gift" is better said of the Holy Spirit than "given".

4. Item, « donum est datio irreddibilis »;[3] sed quiquid Deus dat, irreddibiliter dat, quia cum det, nihil potest recipere: ergo in divinis *datum* rationem habet *doni* et induit eius rationem: ergo convenientius ibi dicitur donum quam datum.

4. Likewise, « a gift is an un-returnable giving »;[3] but whatever God gives, He gives in an un-returnable manner, because though He gives, He can receive nothing: therefore among the divine a "*given*" has the reckoning of a "g*ift*" and puts on its reckoning: therefore more fittingly is He said (to be) a "gift" There than a "given".

CONCLUSIO.

Spiritus sanctus convenientius dicitur donum quam datum, quod duplici ratione probatur.

CONCLUSION

The Holy Spirit is more fittingly said (to be) a "gift" than a "given", which is proved by a twofold reckoning.

R**ESPONDEO:** Dicendum, quod quamvis in divinis utrumque dicatur, et *datum* et *donum*, tamen convenientius dicitur *donum*. Et huius duplex est ratio. Una quidem est, quia *datum*, cum sit vel[4] participium vel nomen verbale, concernit tempus; donum autem a tempore subtrahit; et ideo, quia omnia divina[5] supra tempus sunt, convenientius dicitur in divinis *donum* quam *datum*. Alia ratio est, quia donum supra rationem dati addit conditionem liberalitatis sive irreddibilitatis, quae est conditio magnae nobilitatis, et ideo maxime competit[6] divinis. Et haec est ratio, quare donum appropriatur gratuitis donis, non tantum ipsi Spiritui sancto, qui est principium gratuitorum donorum.

I **RESPOND:** It must be said, that although among the divine each is said, both "*given*" and "*gift*", yet "*gift*" is more fittingly said. And the reason for this is twofold. One indeed is, because "given", since it is either[4] a participle and/or a verbal noun, concerns time; but a "gift" subtracts from time; and for that reason, because all divine (things)[5] are above time, more fittingly is there said among the divine "*gift*", than "*given*". The other reason is, because "gift" adds upon the reckoning of "given" the condition of liberality or un-returnability, which is a condition of great nobility; and for that reason it is most suitable [maxime competit][6] to the divine. And this is the reason, why "gift" is appropriated to gratuitous gifts, not only to the Holy Spirit Himself, who is the Principle of gratuitous gifts.

1. Et ex hoc patet responsio ad illud de auctoritate beati Iacobi.

1. And from this the response is clear to that (objection) concerning the authority of blessed James.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod[7] mobilis et moti eadem est ratio; dicendum, quod non est simile de mobili et moto, et de dono et dato: quia *motum esse* addit supra mobile *actum*[8] et dicit totum, quod dicit mobile. Sed datum non dicit totum, quod dicit donum, quantum est de generali intellectu[9] nominis, nisi approprietur; « donum enim est datio irreddibilis », et hoc melius patebit in quarto problemate.

2. To that which is objected, that[7] of the mobile and the moved there is the same reckoning; it must be said, that it is not similar concerning the mobile and the moved, and concerning "gift" and "given": because that "it has been moved" adds above "the mobile" an *act*[8] and means the whole, which "mobile" means. But "given" does not mean the whole, which "gift" means, as much as it concerns the general

understanding[9] of the noun, unless it is appropriated, « for a "gift" is an unreturnable giving », and this will be more clear in the fourth problem.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod actus est perfectio potentiae; dicendum, quod aliquid est in potentia ad actum dupliciter: aut propter imperfectionem *agentis*, aut propter defectum *suscipientis*. Si sit potentia primo modo, tunc actus est perfectio potentiae, si autem secundo modo, non est perfectio.[10] Unde si dicatur, quod sol actu lucens *potest* domum illuminare, quae non est aperta, et donum apertam *illuminat*, nulla omnino maior notatur perfectio[11] quam ante. Sic intelligendum est de donabilitate et actuali donatione.

3. To that which is objected, that an act is the perfection of potency; it must be said, that something is in potency as regards act in a twofold manner: either on account of the imperfection of the *agent*, or on account of the defect of the *one taking it up*. If there is a potency in the first manner, then the act is the perfection of the potency, but if in the second manner, it is not (its) perfection.[10] Whence if there is said, that the shining Sun by act *can* illumine the house, which has is not open, and *does illumine* the house opened, there is noted entirely no greater perfection[11] than before. In this manner it must be understood concerning donability and actual donation.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod[12] datum est ratio dicendi donum, quia ideo donum, quia datur; dicendum, quod non est tota ratio, sicut dicitur in littera,[13] sed solum in comparatione ad eum cui datur. — Vel potest dici quantum a parte nostri intellectus: ideo donum dicitur, quia datur; sed tamen a parte veritatis[14] rei est e converso, quia ideo datur, quia donum est.

4. To that which is objected, that[12] "given" is the reason for saying "gift", because (it is) for that reason a "gift", because it is given; it must be said, that it is not the entire reason, just as is said in the text (of Master Peter),[13] but only in comparison to him to whom it is given. — And/or it can be said on the part of our intellect: for this reason is He said (to be) a "gift", because He is given; but yet on the part of the truth[14] of the thing it is the other way around, because for this reason is He given, because He is a "gift".

SCHOLION.

I. Solutio ad ult. servire potest ad magis illustrandam solutionem ad 3. Nos quidem res creatas *ex donato* seu actu donationis nominamus *donum*, sed hoc non valet de infinito et aeterno dono, quod est Spiritus sanctus, qui minime unquam est in potentia, ut sit donum, et dum donatur, non reducitur ad actum *doni*, sed tantum *donati*. *Donatum* autem, cum donatio fiat in tempore, est ratio tantum extrinseca doni aeterni.

II. In conclusione omnes conveniunt Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 64. n. 2. ad 3. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 2; S. I. q. 38. a. 2. — B. Albert., hic a. 2. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 2. a. 2 quaestiunc. 2. — Richard. a Med., hic q. 1. ad. 2. — Henr. Gand., de hac et duabus seqq. S. a. 61. q. 3. n. 19. 20, et q. 8. n. 5. seqq.

SCHOLIUM

I. The solution to the last objection can serve to illustrate better the solution to n. 3. We indeed name created things *from the grant* or act of donation a "*gift*", but this is not valid concerning the infinite and eternal Gift, which is the Holy Spirit, who is not at all in potency ever, as a gift is, and when He is granted, is not reduced to the act of *a gift*, but only (to that) of *a granted*. But *having been granted*, since the donation comes to be in a time, there is only the extrinsic reckoning of an eternal gift.

II. In the conclusion all agree: Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 64, n. 2, in reply to n. 3. — St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 2; Summa., I, q. 38, a. 2. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 2. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 2, a. 2, quaestiunc. 2. — Richard of Middleton, here in q. 1, in reply to n. 2. — Henry of

Ghent, on this and the following 2 questions, Summa., a. 61, q. 3, nn. 19 and 20, and q. 8, n. 5 ff.

[1] In cod. I additur hic aliud argumentum: *Idem* (donum) *dicit comparationem personae ad personam, datam vero personae ad creaturam; sed magis proprie comparatur persona ad personam quam persona ad creaturam: ergo convenientius dicitur donum de Spiritu sancto quam donum* (datum).
[2] Vers. 17, apud Lyranum: Datum refertur ad naturam, donum ad gratiam.
[3] Aristot., IV. Top. c. 4. Vide supra q. 2. arg. 4. ad opp. — Mox cod. S. *cum dat* loco *cum det*.
[4] Ex multis mss. ut A F G I S T X etc. et ed. 1 adiecimus *vel*. Haec ratio explicatur verbis B. Alberti, hic a. 2: Datum, quod est participium et consignificat tempus, similiter datio et donatio nomina sunt verbalia et ita actus temporales consignificantia, licet non consignificant tempus.
[5] Multi codd. cum edd. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 *dona* pro *divina*, et ed. 1 *dona* loco *omnia*, sed minus apte, ut per se patet; error codicum forsan ex abbreviatione verbi *divina* ortus est. S. Thomas eandem rationem hic a. 2 afferens ait: Inde est, quod donum competit magis divinis, quae sine tempore sunt, quam datum. — Paulo ante codd. L O cum ed. 1 *abstrahit* loco *subtrahit*, quae lectio communi loquendi modomagis congruit.
[6] Nonnulli codd. ut I W *convenit*.
[7] In pluribus mss. ut A T V et ed. 4 deest *quod*. Paulo infra plurimi mss. cum sex primis edd. *donato* pro *dato*, quod minus congruit subnexis.
[8] Multi codd. cum ed. 1 omittunt *actum*, pluresque ut A C S V W aa bb dein cum edd. 3, 6 ponunt *motum* loco *mobile*; cod. cc vero cum ed. 2 habet *mobile motum*.
[9] Cod. V *intentione*. Paulo infra cod. Z *sed* pro *et*.
[10] In cod. V additur *potentiae*.
[11] Aliqui codd. ut L O Z addunt bene *in sole*.
[12] Ex plurimis mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *quod*.
[13] Cap. 2.
[14] Vat. praeter fidem fere omnium mss. et ed. 1 omittit *veritatis*.

[1] In codex I there added this other argument: *The same* ("gift") *means a comparison of Person to Person, but "given" of the Person to a creature; but more properly is the Person compared to a Person than the Person to a creature: therefore more fittingly is there said "gift" of the Holy Spirit, than "gift"* (given).
[2] Verse 17, in Nicolas of Lyra: "Given" is referred to nature, "gift" to grace.
[3] Aristotle, Topics, Bk. IV, ch. 4. See above q. 2, 4th opposing argument . — Next codex S has *when He gives* [dum dat] for *though He gives* [cum det].
[4] From many manuscripts, such as A F G I S T X etc. and edition 1, we have inserted *either* [vel]. This reckoning is explained by the words of Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus) here in a. 2: "Given", which is a particle and signifies a time, similarly giving and granting are verbal nouns and thus signify temporal acts, though they do not signify a time.
[5] Many codices, together with editions 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, have *gifts* [dona] for *divine (things)* [divina], and edition 1 reads *divine gifts* [dona divina] in place of *all gifts* [omnia divina], but less aptly, as is it is clear; the error of the codices perhaps has arisen from the abbreviation of the word *divine* [divina]. St. Thomas offers the same reckoning here in a. 2: Hence it is, that "gift" is very suitable to divine (things), which are without time, than (is) "given". — A little before this codices L and O, together with edition 1, have *abstracts* [abstrahit] in place of *substracts* [subtrahit], which reading is more congruous with the common manner of speaking.
[6] Not a few codices, such as I and W, read *it is most fitting* [maxime convenit].
[7] In very many manuscripts, such as A T V, and edition 4, there is lacking *that* [quod]. A little below this very many manuscripts, together with six first editions, have *"granted"* [donato] for *"given"* [dato], which is less congruous with what follows.
[8] Many codices, together with edition 1, omit *an act* [actum], and very many, such as A C S V W aa and bb, then, together with editions 3 and 6, put *"moved"* [motum] in place of *"mobile"* [mobile]; but codex cc, together with edition 2, has *"the mobile" a movement* [mobile motum].
[9] Codex V has *intention* [intentione]. A little below this codex Z has *but* [sed] for *and* [et].
[10] In codex V there is added *of potency* [potentiae].
[11] Some codices, such as L O and Z, add well *in the Sun* [in sole].
[12] From very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *that* [quod].
[13] Chapter 2.
[14] The Vatican edition, not trusting in nearly all the manuscripts and edition 1, omits *of the truth* [veritatis].

likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVIII.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio IV.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 328-329.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

QUAESTIO IV.

Utrum donum sit nomen essentiale, an personale et proprium Spiritus sancti.

QUARTO QUAERITUR, utrum donum *proprie* conveniat Spiritui sancto. Et quod sic videtur.

1. Augustinus decimo quinto de Trinitate:[1] « Sicut in Trinitate non est verum nisi Filius, ita nec donum nisi Spiritus sanctus ».

2. Item, donum dicit emanationem per modum liberalitatis; hoc autem est proprium solius Spiritus sancti: ergo etc.

3. Item, donum[2] dicitur relative ad donantem; sed donans non tantum est Pater, immo etiam Filius, quia uterque est mittens, ergo donum dicitur relative ad Patrem et Filium: et si hoc, ergo[3] distinguitur ab utroque: ergo nec Pater nec Filius, sed solum Spiritus sanctus dicitur proprie donum.

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVIII

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 4

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 328-329.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUESTION 4

Whether "gift" is an essential name, or a personal and proper one of the Holy Spirit.

FOURTH THERE IS ASKED, whether "gift" *properly* befits the Holy Spirit. And it seems that it does.

1. (St.) Augustine in the fifteenth (chapter) On the Trinity (says):[1] « Just as in the Trinity none is a "truth", but the Son, so also none a "gift", but the Holy Spirit ».

2. Likewise, "gift" means an emanation through the manner of liberality; but this is proper to the Holy Spirit alone: ergo etc..

3. Likewise, "gift"[2] is said in a manner relative to the one granting; but the One granting is not only the Father, nay also the Son, because Each is the One sending; therefore "gift" is said in a manner relative to the Father and the Son: and if this, therefore[3] it is distinguished from Each: therefore neither the Father nor the Son, but only the Holy Spirit is properly said (to

be) a "gift".

Contra: 1. Donum dicitur in habitu, sed datum dicitur in actu, ergo datum addit supra donum: ergo cui convenit esse datum convenit[4] et ratio doni. Sed datum convenit toti Trinitati, quia tota Trinitas dat se, ergo et donum: non ergo proprie Spiritui sancto.

On the contrary: 1. "Gift" is said in regard to a habit [in habitu], but "given" is said in regard to an act, therefore "given" adds above "gift": therefore to the one it is fitting to be a "given", the reckoning of "gift" is also fitting.[4] But "given" befits the whole Trinity, because the whole Trinity gives Itself, therefore also "gift": therefore it is not properly (said) of the Holy Spirit.

2. Item, donum dicit respectum ad dantem et ad eum cui datur: si ergo est proprium Spiritus sancti, aut propter resepctum ad *dantem*, aut[5] *recipientem*. Non propter respectum ad *recipientem*, quia similiter *Filius datus est nobis*,[6] et magis etiam datus quam Spiritus sanctus. Si vero ad dantem; *contra*: Filius dicitur procedere a dante, scilicet a Patre: ergo videtur secundum communem[7] rationem Filio convenire. *Si dicas*, quod Filius non procedit per modum donabilis, neque « quomodo datus est, sed quomodo natus »;[8] *contra*: Filius sic ab aeterno processit, ut temporaliter esset missibilis, quia « eo mittitur Filius, quo generatur »;[9] sed missio non est aliud quam donatio: ergo Filius processit ut donabilis.

2. Likewise "gift" means a looking-back to the one giving and to the one to whom it is given: if, therefore, it is proper to the Holy Spirit, (it is) either on account of the looking-back to the *one giving*, or[5] the *one receiving*. Not on account of the looking-back to the *one receiving*, because similarly the *Son has been given to us*,[6] and (He has) been given more than the Holy Spirit. If, on the other hand, to the one giving; *on the contrary*: the Son is said to proceed from the One giving, that is from the Father: therefore ("gift") seems to befit the Son according to the common[7] reckoning. *If you say*, that the Son does not proceed through the manner of a grantable, and not « in the manner He has been given, but in the manner (He has been) born »;[8] *on the contrary*: the Son proceeded from eternity in this manner, that He would be sendable temporally, because « the Son is sent for the reason that He is generated »;[9] but being sent [missio] is not other than being granted [donatio]: therefore the Son proceeds as a grantable.

3. Item, si datus est Filius ex tempore, aut erat ad hoc habilis ab aeterno, aut non. Si *sic*: ergo processit ut donabilis; si *non*: ergo aliquid convenit ex tempore Filio, quod repugnat aeternae emanationi; quod est inconveniens.

3. Likewise, if the Son has been given in time, either He was able for this from eternity, or not. If *so*: therefore He has proceeded as a grantable; if *not*: therefore something in time befits the Son, which is repugnant to the eternal emanation; which is unfitting.

4. Item, regula est, quod omne nomen dicens respectum vel effectum ad creaturas est commune tribus;[10] sed donum est huiusmodi: ergo etc.

4. Likewise, the rule is, that every noun meaning a looking-back and/or effect towards creatures is common to the Three;[10] but "gift" is of this kind: ergo etc..

CONCLUSIO.

Donum est nomen personale et proprim Spiritus sancti; datum vero potest dici et essentialiter de tribus personis, et personaliter de Filio et Spiritu sancto, et proprie de Spiritu sancto.

CONCLUSION

"Gift" is a personal and proper name of the Holy Spirit; but "given" can be said both essentially of the Three Persons, and personally of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and properly of the Holy Spirit.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod sicut patet ex verbis Augustini, donum dicitur in divinis proprie sive personaliter, non essentialiter, sicut verbum proprie dicitur de Filio; datum autem potest accipi et essentialiter et personaliter, sive proprie et communiter. Tota enim Trinitas dat se, et tamen Pater et Filius proprie dant Spiritum sanctum.[11]

Propter hoc notandum, quod datum de sui ratione idem est quod communicatum. Potest igitur hoc quod est *datum* dicias communicatum ex *liberalitate*,[12] et sic commune est toti Trinitati; vel ex *liberalitate et auctoritate*, et sic convenit Spiritui sancto et Filio, qui habent subauctoritatem respectu Patris; vel potest dici datum ex *liberalitate et auctoritate* non tantum communicatum, sed etiam *productum*, et hoc modo proprium est Spiritus sancti, cuius proprium est procedere secundum rationem liberalitatis, et ita secundum rationem doni vel donabilis. Et hoc modo donum et[13] datum aequivalent; differunt tamen, quia datum dicit communicationem in actu, sed donum in habitu. Et ita[14] concedendum est, quod donum proprie dicitur in divinis de Spiritu sancto.

1. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod datum addit . . .

I respond: It must be said, that just as is clear from the words of (St.) Augustine, "gift" among the divine is said properly or personally, not essentially, jus as "word" is properly said of the Son; but "given" can be accepted both essentially and personally, or properly and commonly. For the whole Trinity gives Itself, and yet the Father and the Son properly given the Holy Spirit.[11]

On this account it must be noted, that "given" from its own reckoning is the same "communicated". Therefore, that which has been given can be said (to have been) communicated out of *liberality*,[12] an thus is common to the whole Trinity; and/or out of *liberality and authorship*, and thus befits the Holy Spirit and the Son, who have a subauthorship in respect to the Father; and/or the "given" can be said (to have been) out of *liberality and authorship* not only communicated, but also *produced*, and in this manner, and in this manner it is proper to the Holy Spirit, to whom it is proper to proceed according to the reckoning of liberality, and thus according to the reckoning of "gift" and/or "grantable". And in this manner "gift" and[13] "given" are equivalent; however, they do differ, because "given" means a communication in act; but "gift" in habit. And thus[14] it must be conceded, that "gift" is properly said of the Holy Spirit among the divine.

1. To that which is objected, that "given" adds . . .

---

[1] Cap. 17. n. 29: Et tamen non frustra in hac Trinitate non dicitur verbum Dei nisi Filius, nec donum Dei nisi Spiritus sanctus.

[2] Fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 expunximus hic additum *Dei*.

[3] In Vat. deest *ergo*, quod tamen in plurimis mss. habetur.

[4] Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *convenit* et mox *toti*.

[5] In nonnullis mss. ut H K M U et ed. 1 repetitur *ad*.

[6] Isai. 9, 6. — Paulo infra post *Spiritus* ex aliquibus mss. ut H K V X adiecimus *sanctus*.

[7] Ed. 1 cum cod. Z *omnem* loco *communem*. Mox cod. X *procedat* loco *procedit*, ubi in codd. L O additur *ab aeterno*.

[8] August., V. de Trin. d. 14. n. 15. — Mox Vat. cum cod. cc *procedit* loco *processit*, sed contra alios codd. et ed. 1.

[9] Est Gregorii; vide supra pag. 261, nota 1.

[10] Codd. O Z adiungunt: *quia quidquid facit una persona, et omnes; indivisa enim sunt opera*

[1] Chapter 17, n. 29: And yet not as a trick is (any) said in this Trinity (to be) "the Word of God" except the Son, nor "the Gift of God" except the Holy Spirit.

[2] Trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have expunged the here added *of God* [Dei].

[3] In the Vatican edition there is lacking *therefore* [ergo], which however is had in very many manuscripts.

[4] From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *is fitting* [convenit] and then *whole* [toti].

[5] In not a few manuscripts, such as H K M and U and in edition 1, there is found *to* [ad].

[6] Isaiah 9:6. — At the end of the next clause, from some manuscripts, such as H K V and X, we have inserted *Holy* [sanctus].

[7] Edition 1, together with codex Z, has *every* [omnem] in place of *the common* [communem]. Next codex Z has the subjunctive form of *proceed* [procedat], where in codices L and O there is added

Trinitatis. Similiter in quacumque habitudine se habet una persona, et omnes; ut si una persona Dominus, et omnes; si una refugium, et omnes.
[11] Vide supra d. 15. p. I. q. 4.
[12] In cod. O additur *sola*, qui et mox loco *convenit* habet *est commune tantum*. Aliqui codd. ut F H X Z in secundo disiunctionis membro et cod. T etiam in tertio *subauctoritate* pro *auctoritate*, sed incongrue; nam utraque persona, licet se ipsam det ex liberalitate, a Patre datur ex *auctoritate*, non *subauctoritate*; unde *datam* (in senu passivo) utrique convenit, quia *auctoritas Patris* dat Filium et Spiritum sanctum.
[13] Plurimi codd. cum Vat. minus apte *vel*; cod. H cum ed. 1 exhibet lectionem a nobis receptam.
[14] Ex vetustioribus mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *ita*.

from eternity [ab aeterno].
[8] (St.) Augustine, On the Trinity, Bk. V, d. 14, n. 15. — The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, has *proceeds* [procedit] in place of *proceeded* [processit], but contrary to the other codices and to edition 1.
[9] This is from (St.) Gregory (the Great); see above p. 261, footnote 1.
[10] Codices O and Z adjoin: *because whatever one Person does, All also (do); for the works of the Trinity are undivided. Similarly in whatsoever habitude one Person holds Himself, All also (do); such (that) if one Person (is) Lord, All also (are); if one the Refuge, All also (are)* [quia quidquid facit una persona, et omnes; indivisa enim sunt opera Trinitatis. Similiter in quacumque habitudine se habet una persona, et omnes; ut si una persona Dominus, et omnes; si una refugium, et omnes].
[11] See above d. 15, p. I, q. 4.
[12] In codex O there is added *alone* [sola], which codex also next has in place of *befits* [convenit] *is only common to* [est commune tantum]. Some codices, such as F H X and Z in the second member of the disjunction and even codex T in the third have *subauthorship* [subauctoritate] for *authorship* [auctoritate], but incongruously; for each Person, though He gives himself out of liberality, is given by the Father out of *authorship*, non *subauthorship*; whence *as One given* (in the passive sense) it befits Each, because the *authorship of the Father* gives the Son and the Holy Spirit.
[13] Very many codices, together with the Vatican edition, have less aptly *and/or* [vel].
[14] From the older manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *thus* [ita].

---

supra donum; dicendum, quod secundum communem acceptationem *dati* et *doni* donum aliquid dicit ultra quam datum, et datum ultra quam donum. Donum[1] ultra quam datum importat emanationem per modum liberalitatis; datum vero ultra quam donum importat actum communicationis, quia donum dicit habitum. Et ideo, quia illud quod addit donum supra datum, est personale, ideo donum proprie[2] est personae Spiritus sancti.

above "gift"; it must be said, that according to the common acceptation of *given* and *of gift*, "gift" means something further than "given", and "given" further than "gift". "Gift"[1] further than "given" conveys an emanation through the manner of liberality; but "given" further than "gift" conveys the act of communication, because "gift" means a habit. And for that reason, that which "gift" adds above "given", is personal, for that reason "gift" properly[2] belongs to the Person of the Holy Spirit.

2. Ad illud quod quaeritur, ratione cuius respectus dicatur donum proprie; iam patet responsio,[3] quia ratione respectus ad dantem, non inquam ratione respectus simpliciter, sed ratione talis respectus, quia emanat per modum donabilis, quod est proprium Spiritus sancti.

2. To that which is asked, by the reckoning of which respect is "gift" properly said; the response[3] is already clear, because by the reckoning of the respect to the one giving, not, I say, by the reckoning of the respect simply, but by the reckoning of such a respect, that emanates through the manner of a grantable, which is proper to the Holy Spirit.

3. Quod ergo obiicitur, quod emanat per

3. Because, therefore, it is objected, that

modum donabilis Filius; dicendum, quod falsum est. Quamvis enim donabilitas sive liberalitas communicetur Filii generationi,[4] non tamen est ratio emanandi; et quia communicatur aeternaliter, ideo datur temporaltier; sed quia non est ratio emanandi, ideo non emanat Filius ut donum, sed solum Spiritus sanctus.

the Son emanates through the manner of a grantable; it must be said, that it is false. For although grantability or liberality is communicated to the generation of the Son,[4] yet it is not the reckoning of the emanating; and because it is communicated eternally, for that reason it is given temporally; but because it is not the reckoning of the emanating, for that reason the Son does not emanate as a "gift", but only the Holy Spirit (does).

4. Ad illud quod ultimo obiicitur de respectu ad creaturam,[5] dicendum, quod hoc intelligitur de illo nomine, quod importat solum respectum ad creaturam, non personae ad personam; donum autem utrumque importat, ideo non habet hic illa[6] regula locum.

4. To that which is objected last concerning the looking-back to the creature,[5] it must be said, that this is understood of that noun, which conveys only a looking-back to the creature, not of the Person to a Person; but "gift" conveys each, for that reason that[6] rule does not have a place here.

SCHOLION.

I. Quaestio non est, utrum hoc nomen in genere conveniat Spiritui sancto, sed *sub qua ratione* ipsi conveniat, utrum scil. sit nomen *personale* sive proprietas personae, an *essentiale*. — Ut solutio melius intelligatur, sciendum est, in dono divino duas complecti rationes, alteram cum relatione reali ad dantem, alteram cum relatione rationis ad eum cui datur. Respectus ad *dantem*, id est Patrem et Filium, importat, ut Spiritus sanctus emanet per modum donabilis; et ratione huius respectus nomen doni est *proprium* sive personale. Nam recte observat Ricahrd. a Med. (loc. infra cit.): « Donum, prout accipitur in divinis, est res procedens, cui ex suo *modo procedendi* convenit *prima ratio* doni. Prima autem ratio doni *amor* est . . . Proprium autem Spiritui sancto est, quod procedat ut amor ». Altera ratio importat respectum rationis *ad creaturas*. « Nec tamen, ut bene observat S. Thomas (S. I. q. 38. a. 1. ad. 4) per hoc, quod in dono importatur respectus ad creaturam, oportet, quod sit essentiale, sed quod aliquid essentiale in suo intellectu includatur, sicut essentia includitur in intellectu personae ».

SCHOLIUM

I. The question is not, whether this name in general befits the Holy Spirit, but *under what reckoning* it befits Him, that is, whether it is a *personal* name or a property of the Person, or *an essential one*. — To understand the solution better, it must be understood, that in a divine gift two reckonings are comprised, the one with a real relation to the One giving, the other with a relation of reckoning to the one to whom it is given. The looking-back to the One giving, that is to the Father and the Son, conveys, that the Holy Spirit emanates through the manner of a grantable; and by the reckoning of this looking-back the name "gift" is *proper* or personal. For Richard of Middleton rightly observes (loc. cit., below): « "Gift" insofar as it is accepted among the divine, is a proceeding thing, to which from its own *manner of proceeding* the *first reckoning* of "gift" befits. But the first reckoning of "gift" is love [amor] . . . Moreover it is proper to the Holy Spirit, because He proceeds as Love ». The other reckoning conveys a looking-back of the reckoning *to creatures*: « Nor, however, » as St. Thomas rightly observes (Summa, I, q. 38, a. 1, in reply to n. 4), « through this, that in a gift there is conveyed a looking-back to the creature, is it necessary [opportet], that it be essential, but (rather) that something essential be included in its own understanding, just as essence is included in the understanding of a Person ».

II. Antiqui magistri hic cum Seraphico

II. The ancient masters agree here with the

concordant, exceptio Durando, qui singularem viam tenens docet, hoc nomen Spiritui sancto tantum appropriari, quod bene reprobat Dionys. Carth. (hic q. 2.). — Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 64. n. 1. — Scot., de hac et seqq. in utroque scripto hic q. unic. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 1. 2.; S. loc. cit. — B. Albert., hic a. 3; S. p. I. tr. 8. q. 36. m. 2. partic. 1. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 2. a. 1. quaestiunc. 1. — Richard. a Med., hic q. 1. — Aegid. R., hic 1. princ. q. 1. — De hac et seq. q. Durand., hic q. 1.

Seraphic (Doctor), excepting Durandus, who holding to a singular manner teaches, that this name is only appropriated to the Holy Spirit, which is rightly reproved by (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian (here in q. 2). — Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 64, n. 1. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, on this and the following questions, in each edition, here in q. sole. — St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 1 and 2.; Summa., loc. cit. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 3; Summa., p. I, tr. 8, q. 36, m. 2, partic. 1. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 2, a. 1, quaestiunc. 1. — Richard of Middleton, here in q. 1. — Giles the Roman, here in 1st. princ., q. 1. — On this and the following q., Durandus, here in q. 1.

---

[1] Cod. I addit *enim*. Mox cod. W *dicit* loco *importat*.
[2] Ed. 1 *proprium*.
[3] In plurimis mss. et ed. 1 deest *responsio*.
[4] Aliqui codd. ut T aa etc. et ed. 1 *concomitetur Filii generationem*, qui et paulo infra ponunt *concomitatur* loco *communicatur*. Vat. *communicetur Filii generationi*. In fine responsionis fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *emanat* pro *emanavit*. Dein aliqui codd. ut I S aa cum ed. 1 *solus* loco *solum*.
[5] Aliqui codd. ut S Z hic *creaturas*, quod etiam multo plures codd. cum ed. 1 paulo infra loco *creaturam* exhibent.
[6] Codd. sunt inter se divisi; alii ut F G K M Y Z omittunt *illa*, alii cum Vat. et ed. 1 ponunt *haec* pro *hic illa*, alii ut H O T et quidem melius praestant lectionem in textum receptam.

[1] Codex I add *For* [enim]. Then codex W has *means* [dicit] in place of *conveys* [importat].
[2] Edition 1 has *"gift" is proper to* etc. [donum proprium est].
[3] In very many manuscripts and edition 1 there is lacking *the response* [responsio].
[4] Some codices, such as T aa etc., and edition 1, have *accompanies the generation of the Son* [concomitetur Filii generationem], which also a little below this put *accompanies* [concomitatur] in place of *is communicated* [communicetur]. The Vatican edition has *is communicated to the generation of the Son* [communicetur Filii generationi]. At the end of the response, trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *does emanate* [emanat] for *did emanate* [emenavit]. Then some codices, such as I S and aa, together with edition 1, have *the Holy Spirit alone (does)* [solus Spiritus sanctus].
[5] Some codices, such as S and Z, have *creatures* [creaturas] here, which even very many codices, together with edition 1, a little below this, exhibit in place of *creature* [creaturam].
[6] The codices are divided amongst themselves, some, such as F G K M Y and Z, omit *that* [illa], others, together with the Vatican edition and edition 1, put *this* [haec] for *that . . . here* [hic illa], others, such as H O T and T indeed also present better the reading received in the text.

---

atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVIII.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio V.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 329-332.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

QUAESTIO V.

Utrum donum sive donabilitas sit proprietas distinctiva Spiritus sancti.

QUINTO QUAERITUR, utrum donabilitas sive donum sit proprietas distinctiva personae[7] Spiritui sancti. Et quod sic, videtur.

1. Dicit enim Augustinus quinto de Trinitate:[8] « Eo est donum, quo spiritus »; sed spiritus est proprietas distinctiva: ergo et donum.

2. Item, Augustinus quinto de Trinitate,[9] assignans differentiam processionis Filii et Spiritus sancti, hanc ponit, quod ille procedit per modum nati, sed iste per modum doni, ergo si haec differentia attenditur penes proprietates distinctivas, ut patet, quia nativitas est proprietas Filii: ergo et donabilitas sive donum est proprietas Spiritus sancti.

3. Item, hoc ipsum videtur[10] *ratione*, quia omnis proprietas, secundum quam persona differt ab omnibus aliis, est personae proprietas distinctiva; sed donum inest soli personae Spiritus sancti et semper: ergo est proprietas eius personalis.[11]

& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVIII

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 5

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 329-332.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUESTION 5

Whether "gift" or "grantability" is a distinctive property of the Holy Spirit.

FIFTH THERE IS ASKED, whether "grantability" or "gift" is a distinctive property of the Person[7] of the Holy Spirit. And it seems that it is.

1. For (St.) Augustine says in the fifth (book) On the Trinity:[8] « He is a "gift" for this, that (His is) a spirit »; but "spirit" is a distinctive property (of the Holy Spirit): therefore also "gift".

2. Likewise, (St.) Augustine in the fifth (book) On the Trinity,[9] assigning the difference of the procession of the Son and the Holy Spirit, posits this, that the Former proceeds through the manner of one born, but the Latter through the manner of a gift, therefore if this difference is attained from within the distinctive properties (of Each), as is clear, because "nativity" is a property of the Son: therefore also "grantability" or "gift" is a property of the Holy Spirit.

3. Likewise, this very (thing) seems[10] by *reason*, because every property, according to which a Person differs from the all Others, is a distinctive property of the Person; but "gift" is in the Person alone of the Holy Spirit and always: therefore it is

His personal property.[11]

[7] Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 omittit *personae*.
[8] Cap. 11. n. 12, et IV. c. 20. n. 29. Vide hic lit. Magistri, c. 2, ex quo haec verba sumta sunt.
[9] Cap. 14. et 15. et 16; cfr. hic lit. Magistri, c. 2. in fine et c. 3, in princ. — Multi codd. cum ed. 1 *decimo quinto* pro *quinto*, in quo c. 17. n. 29. seqq. etiam haec differentia insinuatur. — Paulo infra in multis mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 ponitur *dati* loco *nati*, sed perperam, ut ex subnexis colligitur; cod. I *nascentis* pro *nati*.
[10] Cod. V *ostenditur*. Paulo infra cod. A *distinguitur* loco *differt*.
[11] In hoc argumento secundum illud effatum: constituivum rei est distinctivum ipsius, et vice vera, promiscue adhibentur termini *proprietas, secundum quam persona differt ab omnibus aliis* et *in est soli personae et semper* (cfr. Porphyr., de Praedicab. c. de Proprio), ac *proprietas personae distintiva* et *proprietas personalis*, ideoque a parte rei ipsum argumentum ex pluribus contractum exhibetur. Vel dic, quod loco minoris iuxta formam syllogisticam ponendae: *sed donum est proprietas, secundum quam persona Spiritus sancti differt ab omnibus aliis*, ponitur *ratio* ipsius.

[7] The Vatican edition, contrary to the manuscripts and edition 1, omits *of the Person* [personae].
[8] Chapter 11, n. 12, and Bk. IV, ch. 20, n. 29. See here the text of Master (Peter), ch. 2, out of which these words have been taken.
[9] Chapters 14, 15 and 16; cf. here the text of Master (Peter), ch. 2, at the end, and ch. 3, at the beginning. — Many codices, together with edition 1, have *in the fifteenth* [decimo quinto] for *in the fifth* [quinto], in which book, ch. 17, n. 29 ff, this difference is also hinted at. — A little below this in many manuscripts and in editions 1, 2, 3 and 6 there is put *of one given* [dati] in place of *of one born* [nati], but faultily, as is gathered from what follows; codex I has *of one being born* [nascientis] in place of *of one born* [nati].
[10] Codex V has *is shown* [ostenditur]. A little below this codex A has *is distinguished* [distinguitur] in place of *differs* [differt].
[11] In this argument according to that statement of the proposition [effatum]: 'that which is constitutive of a thing is distinctive of it, and vice versa', there is in the common manner employed the terms '*property, according to which a Person differs from all Others*' and '*is in the Person alone and always*' (cf. Porphyry, On Predicables, ch. "on the Proper"), and '*a distinctive property of the Person*' and '*personal property*', and for that reason on the part of the thing the argument itself is exhibited contracted by many. And/or say, that in the place of the minor according to the syllogistic form there must be put: *but "gift" is the property, according to which the Person of the Holy Spirit differs from all Others*, is posited as the *reason* for it.

p. 330

4. Item, proprietates in divinis sunt relationes; sed Augustinus dicit in quinto de Trinitate,[1] quod « relatio, secundum quam refertur Spiritus sanctus ad Patrem et Filium, magis apparet in hoc nomine donum quam in hoc nomine spiritus »;[2] ergo utraque est personalis.

4. Likewise, properties among the divine are relations; but (St.) Augustine says in the fifth (book) On the Trinity,[1] that « a relation, according to which the Holy Spirit is referred to the Father and the Son, appears more in this name "gift" than in this name "spirit" [2] »; therefore each is personal.

Contra: 1. Nihil dicens respectum ad creaturas est proprietas distinctiva personae, quia, omni respectu ad creaturam circumscripto, tenet distinctio personalis; sed donum dicit respectum ad eum cui datur: ergo etc. *Si dicas*, quod non est proprietas secundum comparationem, quam habet ad creaturas, sed ad dantem; pari ratione missio Spiritus sancti[3] erit proprietas distinctiva, cum dicat respectum ad mittentem.

On the contrary: 1. Nothing meaning a looking-back to creatures is a distinctive property of a Person, because, a personal distinction holds, having excluded every looking-back to a creature; but "gift" means a looking-back to him to whom it is given: ergo etc.. *If you say*, that it is not a property according to the comparison, which it has to creatures, but to the One giving, for an equal reason the being-sent [missio] of the Holy Spirit[3] will be a distinctive property, since it means a looking-back to the One sending.

2. Item, omnis proprietas distinctiva dicitur

2. Likewise, every distinctive property is

ab actu, non ab habitu. Unde Pater dicitur, quia generat, Filius, quia generatur, Spirits vero santus, quia spiratur; sed donum non dicitur ab actu donandi, sed ab habitu, alioquin non diceretur ab aeterno:[4] ergo etc.

said from an act, not from a habit. Wherefore (One) is said (to be) "the Father", because He generates, (Another) "the Son", because He is generated, but (the Third) "the Holy Spirit", because, He is spirated; but "gift" is not said from the act of granting, but from the habit, otherwise it would not be said from eternity:[4] ergo etc..

3. Item, nullius alterius personae proprietas distinctiva accipitur in relatione ad creaturas[5] vel dicit respectum; sed donum dicit hoc: ergo non est proprietas distinctiva.

3. Likewise, no other Person's distinctive property is accepted in relation to creatures[5] and/or means a looking-back (to creatures); but "gift" means this: therefore it is not a distinctive property.

4. Item, si donum est proprietas distinctiva Spiritus sancti et eius notio, tunc ergo spiritus sanctus et amor non est proprietas: quodsi[6] spiritus sanctus et amor est proprietas, ergo sunt septem notiones, quod est contra communem opinionem omnium. *Si dicas*, quod eadem notio[7] importatur per haec tria nomina, ergo videntur nomina synonyma, ut Marcus, Tullius, quod aeque magnum inconveniens est: ergo etc.

4. Likewise, if "gift" is a distinctive property of the Holy Spirit and His notion, then "holy spirit" and "love" is not a property: wherefore if[6] "holy spirit" and "love" is a property, therefore there are seven notions, which is contrary to the common opinion of all. *If you say*, that the same notion[7] is conveyed through these three names, therefore the names seem (to be) synonymous, as "Marcus", "Tullius", which is equally very unfitting: ergo etc..

CONCLUSIO.

Donum est proprietas distinctiva Spiritus sancti secundum respectum ad dantem, quin tamen excludatur ratio donabilitatis sive respectus secundum aptitudinem ad eum cui datur.

CONCLUSION

"Gift" is a distinctive property of the Holy Spirit according to the looking-back to the One giving, yet there is not excluded a reckoning of grantability or a looking-back, according to aptitude, to the one to whom He is given.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod ad hoc dixerunt aliqui, quod donum dupliciter est in divinis considerare: uno modo, prout dicit respectum solum ad *donatorem*; et hoc modo dicit Augustinus[8], quod « eo dicitur donum, quo procedit »; et sic dicunt, quod donum est proprietas distinctiva Spiritus sancti. Alio modo accipitur[9] donum, prout dicit respectum ad eum cui datur; et sic non dicit proprietatem distinctivam, sed consequens ad proprietatem distinctivam.

I respond: It must be said, that as regards this some have said, that there is a twofold considering of "gift" among the divine: in one manner, insofar as it means a looking-back alone to the *granter*; and in this manner (St.) Augustine says,[8] that « He is said (to be) "gift" for this, that He proceeds »; and in this manner they say, that "gift" is a distinctive property of the Holy Spirit. In another manner "gift" is accepted,[9] insofar as it means a looking-back to him to whom it is given, and in this manner it does not mean a distinctive property, but (is) consequent to a distinctive property.

Sed illud non videtur posse stare. Nam donum semper aliquam comparationem dicit ad eum cui datur; intellecto enim, quod non sit donabilis alicui, impossibile est intelligere, quod sit donum.

But that does not seem able to stand. For "gift" always means some comparison to him to whom it is given; for having understood, that it is not grantable to anyone, it is impossible to understand, that it is a "gift".

Et propter hoc aliter dicendum, sicut prius

And on this account it must be otherwise

tactum est,[10] quod donum praeter respectum, quem importat ad dantem, importat respectum ad eum cui datur. Sed hoc potest esse tripliciter: vel secundum *actum*, ut quia datus;[11] vel secundum *habitum*, ut quia dandus; vel secundum *aptitudinem*, ut quia donabilis. Et iste respectus[12] adeo coniunctus est primo, ut primus sine hoc non possit esse nec intelligi, immo de necessitate sequitur, si procedit per modum doni, quod sit donabilis: et ideo sequens respectus non aufert primo, quin sit proprietas distintiva.[13] Dicendum ergo, quod est proprietas distinctiva ratione primi respectus, secundo respectu non repugnante, sed consonante.

said, just as has been touched upon before,[10] that "gift" besides the looking-back, which it conveys to the one giving, conveys a looking-back to him to whom it is given. But this can be in a threefold manner: either according to *act*, as because (He has been) given;[11] and/or according to *habit*, such as because (He is to) be given; and/or according to *aptitude*, as because (He is) grantable. And this looking-back[12] has been so conjoined to the first, that the first without this one cannot be nor be understood, nay it of necessity follows, if He proceeds through the manner of a gift, that He is grantable: and for that reason the following looking-back does not take away from the first, which is not a distinctive property.[13] Therefore, it must be said, that it is a distinctive property by the reckoning of the first looking-back, with the second looking-back not repugnant, but consonant (with this).

---

[1] Cap. 11. n. 12.
[2] Cod. X addit *sanctus*; cod. O autem *ergo hoc nomen donum magis dicit proprietatem distinctivam quam hoc nomen spiritus sanctus*.
[3] In Vat. deest *Spiritus sancti*, quod tamen in mss. et ed. 1 invenitur.
[4] Ed. 1 *aeternaliter* pro *ab aeterno*.
[5] Vat. praeter fidem antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 *creatuam*. Mox post *respectum* supple cum cod. B (in margine) *ad creaturas*. In fine argumenti codd. L O addunt *Spiritus sancti*, certe subaudiendum.
[6] Ita plurimi codd. cum ed. 1; Vat. *quia*.
[7] Ex pluribus mss. ut F H M Q T Z supplevimus *notio*, pro quo cod. O habet *proprietas*, alii autem codd. cum ed. 1, verbis incongrue transpositis, *quod eadem importantur nomina per haec tria*. Paulo infra post *Marcus* ope mss. et sex primarum edd. expunximus *et*.
[8] Libr. IV. de Trin. c. 20. n. 29, et V. c. 11. n. 12. Vide hic lit. Magistri. c. 2.
[9] Vat. cum aliquibus mss. *dicitur*.
[10] Hic q. 2.
[11] Subintellige hic et in sequentibus distinctionis membris: Spiritus sanctus. — Vat., referendo participia ad *donum*, praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 ponit *datum, dandum, donabile*.
[12] Id est tertius modus secundi respectus. — Mox post *primo* ed. 1 explicative addit *scilicet qui est ad dantem*, et cod. T in margine *qui est per respectum ad dantem*. Mox plures codd. ut A F I K R U V post *primus* perperam adiungunt *ita quod*. Dein plures mss. ut C F G H K S V Z habent *nec* pro *non*, et paulo infra cod. Y *qui* loco *si*.
[13] In cod. R additur *ratione primi respectus*. Mox aliqui codd. ut H P Q Y *Unde dicendum* pro *Dicendum ergo*. Paulo infra mendum Vat. ponentis *respectu* correximus fide mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6.

---

[1] Chapter 11, n. 12.
[2] Codex X adds *holy* [sanctus]; codex O, however, has *therefore this name "gift" means a distinctive property more than this name "holy spirit"* [ergo hoc nomen donum magis dicit proprietatem distinctivam quam hoc nomen spiritus sanctus].
[3] In the Vatican edition there is lacking *of the Holy Spirit* [Spiritus sancti], which however is found in the manuscripts and in edition 1.
[4] Edition 1 reads *eternally* [aeternaliter] for *from eternity* [ab aeterno].
[5] The Vatican edition, not trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, has *creature* [creaturam]. Next after *a looking-back* [respectum] supply with codex B (in the margin) *to creatures* [ad creaturas]. At the end of the argument codices L and O add *of the Holy Spirit* [Spiritus sancti], which is certainly to be understood.
[6] Thus very many codices, together with edition 1; the Vatican edition has *because* [quia] for *wherefore if* [quodsi].
[7] From very many manuscripts, such as F H M Q T and Z, we have supplied *notion* [notio], in place of which codex O has *property* [proprietas], but the other codices together with edition 1, having incongruously transposed the words, read *that the same names are conveyed through these three* [quod eadem importantur nomina per haec tria]. A little below this after *Marcus* [Marcus], with the help of the manuscripts and six first editions, we have expunged the *and* [et].
[8] On the Trinity, Bk. IV, ch. 20, n. 29, and Bk. V, ch. 11, n. 12. See here the text of Master (Peter) ch. 2.
[9] The Vatican edition, together with some manuscripts, reads *is said* [dicitur].
[10] Here in q. 2.
[11] Understand here and in the following members of

the distinction: the Holy Spirit. — The Vatican edition, by referring the participles to *gift*, not trusting in the manuscripts and in edition 1, puts *given, to be given, grantable* [datum, dandum, donabile].

[12] That is, the third manner of the second looking-back. — Next after *to the first* [primo], edition 1 adds as an explanation *that is, the one which regards the one giving* [scilicet qui est ad dantem], and codex T in the margin has *which is through the looking-back to the one giving* [qui est per respectum ad dantem]. Next very many codices, such as A F I K R U V, after *that the first* [ut primus] faultily insert *such that* [ita quod]. Then very many manuscripts, such as C F G H K S V and Z, have *neither* [nec] for -*not* [non], and a little below this codex Y has *who* [qui] in place of *if He* [si].

[13] In codex R there is added *by the reckoning of the first looking-back* [ratione primi respectus]. Next some codices, such as H P Q and Y, read *Wherefore, there must be said* [Unde dicendum] for *Therefore, it must be said* [Dicendum ergo]. A little below this the error of the Vatican edition of putting *according to a looking-back* [respectu] for *looking-back* [respectus], we have corrected with the testimony of the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3, and 6.

---

p. 331

1. Ex hoc patet responsio ad primum, quia ille respectus talis est, quod non potest circumscribi secundum aptitutdinem ob emanationem per modum liberalitatis. Et patet quod non est *simile de missione*, quia dicit respectum secundum actum, non secundum aptitudinem.

1. From this the response to the first (objection) is clear, because that looking-back is such, that it cannot be excluded according to aptitude because of the emanation through the manner of liberality. And it is clear that it is not *similar concerning being sent*, because it means a looking-back according to act, not according to aptitude.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod proprietas distinctiva debet dicere actum; dicendum, quod donum dicit duplicem respectum,[1] et ratione huius dicit comparationem ad duplicem actum. Ratione primi respectus dicit actum *processionis*, ratione secundi dicit actum *communicationis*. Primum actum importat in actu, secundum in habitu; et ratione primi est propriatas distinctiva, non ratione secundi.

2. To that which is objected, that a distinctive property ought to mean an act; it must be said, that "gift" means a twofold looking-back,[1] and by a reckoning of this it means a comparison to a twofold act. By a reckoning of the first looking-back it means the act of *procession*, by the reckoning of the second it means the act of *communication*. It conveys the first act in an act, the second in a habit; and by the reckoning of the first it is a distinctive property, not by the reckoning of the second.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod in alia persona hoc non est; respondent[2] quidam, quod Spiritus sanctus est tertia persona; ideo nobis secundum rationem intelligendi immediatior, et ideo proprietas eius sumitur in comparatione ad nos, non sic in aliis.

3. To that which is objected, that this is not in another Person, certain ones respond,[2] that the Holy Spirit is the Third Person; for that reason according to the reckoning of understanding (He is) more immediate to us, and for that reason His property is taken in comparison to us, not so among the

Others.

Aliter potest solvi per interemptionem, quia, sicut donum respectum dicit ad creaturas, ita et haec proprietas, quae est *verbum*, uta infra patebit.[3]

It can be solved in another manner through interemption, because, just as "gift" means a looking-back to creatures, so also this property, which is "*word*", as will be clear below.[3]

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur de pluralitate notionum; dicendum, quod spiritus, amor et donum eandem proprietatem dicunt, ratione differentem. Eandem, inquam, notionem dicunt, quia dicunt comparationem ad idem et dicunt eandem emanationem, sed tamen differenter eam nominant. Nam spiritus dicit eam principaltier per comparationem ad vim producentem, quae est vis spirativa; amor principaltier quantum ad modum emanandi, quia ut nexus; donum vero quantum ad respectum[4] consequentem. Et similiter emanationem Verbi contingit tripliciter significare, scilicet per hoc nomen filius, imago et verbum. Quia enim[5] a vi naturae, filius; quia per modum expressum, imago; quia aliis expressivum, ideo verbum. Similiter, quia a vi spirativa, spiritus; quia per modum nexus, amor; quia nos natus connectere, donum. Et sic patet, quod una est notio aliter et aliter nominata secundum rationes consequentes,[6] ideo non est ibi synonymia.

4. To that which is objected concerning the plurality of notions; it must be said, that "spirit", "love" and "gift" mean the same property, differing by a reckoning. I say, the mean the same notion, because they mean a comparison to the same One and they mean the same emanation, but, however, they name it differently. For "spirit" means it principally through a comparison to the producing force, which is the spirative force; "love" principally as much as regards the manner of emanating, because as a Nexus; but "gift" as much as regards the consequent[4] looking-back. And it happens that the emanation of the Word similarly signifies in a threefold manner, namely, through this name "son", "image" and "word". For[5] because (He emanates) by the force of nature, (His is called) "the Son"; because through an expressed standard of measure [per modum expressum], "the Image"; because as One expressive of others, for that reason "the Word". Similarly, because (the Third Person emanates) by the spirative force, (He is called) "the Spirit"; because through the manner of a nexus; "Love"; because as One born to connect us, "the Gift". And thus it is clear, that there is one notion named now in one manner, now in another, according to consequent[6] reckonings, for that reason there is no synonymy there.

SCHOLION.

I. Postquam in praeced. quaestione S. Doctor probavit, donum esse nomen personale Spiritus sancti, non essentiale, in hac duplicem resolvit questionem. *Prima* est, utrum donum non tantum significet proprietatem in Spiritu sancto, sed proprietatem *distinctivam*. Duplicis enim generis sunt proprietates in divinis: aliae sunt quidem personarum, sed non *personales* in stricto sensu, i.e. personarum *distinctivae* vel etiam *constitutivae*; sic est spiratio activa in Patre et Filio, quae neutram personam nec constitutit nec distinguit, cum sit duabus personis communis. Aliae simul personam

SCHOLIUM

I. After the Seraphic Doctor has proven in the preceding question, that "gift" is a personal name of the Holy Spirit, not an essential one, he resolves it in this twofold question. The *first* is, whether "gift" not only signifies a property in the Holy Spirit, but a *distinctive* property. For properties among the divine belong to a twofold genus: some are indeed are of the Persons, but not *personal ones* in the strict sense, i.e. *distinctive* and/or even *constitutive* of the Persons; thus there is "active spiration" in the Father and the Son, which has not constituted nor distinguished either Person, since it is common to the Two Persons.

distinguunt et *constituunt*, ut Paternitas, Filiatio et Spiratio passiva. Unde dicit S. Bonaventura (infra d. 28. q. 3.): « Ad hoc, quod aliqua relatio sit *personalis*, oportet quod dicat illius personae primam et propriam habitudinem et per modum positionis et completionis »; cfr. etiam d. 26. q. 2. et 3. — *Prima* haec quaestio resolvitur cum sententia communi affirmative et probatur argumentis in fundam. Inter auctores est tamen differentia opinionis circa incidentem quaestionem, utrum haec proprietas sit non tantum *distinctiva*, sed etiam *constitutiva*. Hoc videtur affirmare Magister docendo, quod donum sit formaliter ipsa processio Spiritus sancti. Scotus vero (hic q. unica) hoc negat, cum iuxta ipsum donum primo et principaltier significet *respectum ad creaturas* et tantum ex consequenti aliquid *notionale*. Sed quod ex consequenti tantum ad aliquam rem pertinet, non potest esse eiusdem *constitutivum*, sed ad summum distinctivum. At S. Bonav. et Richard. a Med. (hic q. 2.) docent, donum significare per se relationem ad dantem, sed cum respectu superaddito donabilitatis, et ratione primi esse proprietatem distinctivam per se, et non tantum ex consequenti, ut vult Scotus: ergo etiam constitutivam.

Others simultaneously *distinguish* and *constitute* a Person, such as “Paternity”, “Filiation” and “Passive Spiration”. Whence (St.) Bonaventure says (below in d. 28, q. 3): « For this, that some relation be *personal*, it is necessary that it mean the first and proper habitude of that Person and through the manner of position and completion »; cf. also d. 26, q. 2 and 3. — This *first* question is resolved with the common sentence in the affirmative manner and is proven by the arguments in the fundament. Among the authors there is, however, a difference of opinion about the incidental question, whether this property is not only *distinctive*, but also *constitutive*. Master (Peter) seems to affirm this by teaching, that “gift” formally is the very procession of the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here in the q. sole, denies this, though according to him “gift” itself signifies first and principally a *looking-back to creatures* and only is something *notional* ex consequenti. But what pertains only ex consequenti to some thing, cannot be *constitutive* of the same, but at most distinctive (of it). But St. Bonaventure and Richard of Middleton, here in q. 2, teach, that “gift” signifies per se a relation to the one giving, but with the superadded respect of grantability, and by a reckoning of the first is a distinctive property per se, and not only ex consequenti, as Scotus would have it: therefore (it is) also constitutive.

De *altera* quaestione agitur in ipsa responsione, quae est haec: si donum est proprietas Spiritus sancti, et si in dono sunt duo respectus, et ad dantem et ad eum cui datur: iterum quaeritur, utrum sit proprietas distinctiva solummodo secundum primum respecutm, qui importat originem, an etiam aliquo modo secundum respectum *ad creaturas*. Hic respectus ad creaturas triplici modo potest intelligi, nempe vel secundum *actum* (ut *datum*), vel secundum *habitum* (ut *dandum*), vel secundum *aptitudinem* (ut *donabile*). Si respectus ad creaturas primo et secundo modo intelligitur, ipse manifeste non potest esse proprietas personarum distinctiva. Si tertio modo, tunc controvertitur, et ponuntur illae sententiae, quae in corp. exponuntur. Prima opinio hanc Spiritus sancti

The *other* question is dealt with in the response itself, which is this: if “gift” is a property of the Holy Spirit, and if in a gift there are two looking-backs, both to the one giving and to him to whom it is given: again there is asked, whether it is a distinctive property only according to the first looking-back, which conveys the origin, or also in some manner according to the looking-back *to creatures*. This looking-back to creatures can be understood in a threefold manner, namely either according to *act* (as a “*given*”), or according to a *habit* (as a “*to be given*”), and/or according to an *aptitude* (as a “*grantable*”). If the looking-back to creatures is understood in the first and second manner, it manifestly cannot be a distinctive property of the Persons. If in the third manner, then there is a controversy,

aptitudinem, ut creaturis donetur, omnino excludit a proprietate eius distinctiva, hac praesertim innixa ratione, quod haec donabilitas sit aliquid proprietatem distinctivam consequens. Secunda opinio, quam approbat S. Bonva. cum Richardo, asserit, donabilitatem non posse penitus excludi a proprietate distinctiva propter respectum ad dantem. Quoad rationem adductam concedit Sanctus (ad 4.), donabilitatem dicere respectum *consequentem*; tamen putat, hunc respectum esse ita coniunctum alteri ad dantem, ut donum sine donabilitate nequeat intelligi, sive aliis verbis, esse quidem consequens, sed ut aliquid intrisece *proprium*, simili modo ut ratio *risibilis* propria est homini. — Eandem . . .

[1] In cod. T addiungitur *scilicet ad dantem et ad recipientem*.
[2] Vat., reluctantibus mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 *respondet*. Paulo infra post *immediatior* cod. I addit *est*.
[3] Dist. 27. p. II. q. 2.
[4] Ed. 1 adiungit *communem*. Mox ex plurimis codd. posuimus *significare* pro *significari*.
[5] Vat. cum cod. cc omittit *enim*, quod in antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 exstat. Dein Vat. post *modum* falso et praeter fidem mss. et sex primarum edd. *expressivum* loco *expressum*. Cfr. verba S. Doctoris ex d. 27. p. II. q.. 3: Nam sapientia vel notia dicit primum in intelligendo; deinde filius, qui dicit ipsam emanationem sive conceptionem; deinde imago, quae dicit modum *expressum* emanandi; et tertio loco verbum, quod dicit haec omnia et superaddit rationem exprimendi et manifestandi. — Paulo infra post *Similiter* ex aliquibus mss. ut X Z et ed. 1 adiecimus *quia*, quod in multis mss. et Vat. minus bene deest.
[6] Cod. Y *differentes*, sed minus distincte, ut patet ex verbis d. 27. p. II. q. 3. modo citatis.

and those sentences, which are expounded in the body, are to be posited. The first opinion entirely excludes this aptitude of the Holy Spirit, that He be granted to creatures, from (being) a distinctive property of His, (and is) chiefly supported by this reckoning, that this grantability is something consequent to the distinctive property. The second opinion, which St. Bonaventure approves together with Richard (of Middleton), asserts, that grantability cannot be entirely excluded from (being) a distinctive property on account of the looking-back to the one giving. In regard to the reason adduced, the Saint concedes (in reply to n. 4), that grantability means a *consequent* looking-back, yet he thinks, that this looking-back is so conjoined to the other regarding the one giving, that "gift" cannot be understood without grantability, or in other words, that it indeed is a consequent, but as something intrinsically *proper*, in a similar manner as the reckoning of *being able to laugh* is proper to man. — The same . . .

[1] In codex T there is added *that is, to the one giving and to the one receiving* [scilicet ad dantem et ad recipientem].
[2] The Vatican edition, with the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3, and 6 striving against this, has *responds* [respondet]. A little below this after *the reckoning of understanding* [rationem intelligendi immediatior] codex I adds *He is* [est].
[3] Distinction 27, p. II, q. 2.
[4] Edition 1 adds *common* [communem]. Next from very many codices we put *signifies* [significare] for *is signified* [significari].
[5] The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, omits *For* [enim], which is extant in the more ancient manuscripts and in edition 1. Then the Vatican edition falsely, and not trusting in the manuscripts and the six first editions, reads *through an expressive manner* [per modum expressivum]. Cf. the words of the Seraphic Doctor, in d. 27, p. II, q. 3: For "wisdom" and/or "knowledge" [notia] mean (that He is) the First in being understood; then "the son", which means the Emanation or Conception Itself; then "image", which means the *expressed* Standard of measure [modum] of the emanating; and in the third place "*word*", which means all these and adds above them a reckoning of expressing and of manifesting. — A little below this after *Similarly* [Simliter], we have inserted, form some manuscripts, such as X Z and edition 1, *because* [quia], which less rightly, is lacking in many manuscripts and in the Vatican edition.
[6] Codex Y has *differing* [differentes], but less distinctly, as is clear from the words in d. 27, p. II, q.

3, cited here in footnote 5.

p. 332

sententiam S. Bonaventura etiam quoad nomen *Verbi* tuetur et clarius explicat infra d. 27. p. II. a. 1. q. 2. Ceteri antiqui magistri vel sustinent primam opinionem, vel non ita accurate distinguunt, sicut Seraphicus. Sententiam S. Thomae Caietanus (ad. S. I. q. 38. a. 2.) secundum primam opinionem exponit; tamen verba S. Thomae in Summa loc. cit. a. 1. ad 4., et I. Sent. d. 18. q. 1. a. 2. parum a sententia S. Bonaventurae discedunt, immo Forestus (de Trinit. p. 486. col. 2.) vult, utrumque idem docere. Ceterum subtilissima haec quaestio non est magni momenti. — Quoad solut. ad 4. et explicationem *notionis* cfr. infra d. 26. q. 4.

sentence does St. Bonaventure also defend in regards to the name "*Word*" and he explains this more clearly below in d. 27, p. II, a. 1, q. 2. All the other ancient masters either uphold the first opinion, and/or not so accurately distinguish it, as the Seraphic Doctor does. The sentence of St. Thomas Cajetan (commenting on Summa, I, q. 38, a. 2) expounds according to the first opinion; however the words of St. Thomas in the Summa, loc. cit., a. 1, in reply to n. 4, and Sent., Bk. I, d. 18, q. 1, a. 2 differ only a little from the sentence of St. Bonaventure, nay Forest (de Trinitate, p. 486, col. 2.) would have it that, each teaches the same. Otherwise, this most subtitle question is not of great moment. — In regard to the solution to n. 4 and the explanation of a *notion*, cf. below d. 26, q. 4.

II. Cfr. Alex. Hal., S. p. I, q. 64. n. 3. — B. Albert., hic a. 4, S. p. I. tr. 8. q. 36. n. 2. partic. 6. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 2. a. 1. quaestiunc. 2. — Richard. a Med., hic q. 2. — Aegid. R., hic 1. princ. q. 2.

II. Cf. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 64, n. 3. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 4; Summa., p. I, tr. 8, q. 36, n. 2, subpart 6. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 2, a. 1, questiuncula 2. — Richard of Middleton, here in q. 2. — Giles the Roman, here in 1st, princ. q. 2.

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVIII.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio VI.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 332-333.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVIII

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 6

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 332-333.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO VI.

Utrum Spiritus sanctus ratione donabilitatis dici possit Spiritus noster.

QUESTION 6

Whether the Holy Spirit by reason of (His) grantability can be said (to be) "our Spirit".

Sexto et ultimo quaeritur, utrum ratione donabilitatis dicatur *Spiritus noster*. Et quod sic videtur:

Sixth and last there is asked, whether by reason of (His) grantability He is said (to be) "*our Spirit*". And it seems that He is:

1. Quia *noster* dicit possessionem; sed nos non habemus[1] aliquid divinum nisi per largitionem et donationem: ergo cum Spiritus sanctus dicat quid divinum, quod dicitur *noster*, hoc est ratione donabilitatis.

1. Because "*our*" means possession; but we do not have[1] anything divine except through largess [largitionem] and donation: therefore since "the Holy Spirit" means something divine, that He is said (to be) "*our*", this is by reason of (His) grantability.

2. Item, hoc etiam videtur, quia[2] dicitur Spiritus noster, non autem dicitur Filius vel Pater noster:[3] ergo propter aliquam proprietatem, quae est in Spiritu sancto et non in Patre et Filio; sed haec non est nisi donabilitas: ergo etc.

2. Likewise, this seems also, because He is[2] said (to be) "our Spirit", but the Son and/or the Father is not said (to be) "ours":[3] therefore on account of some property, which is in the Holy Spirit and not in the Father and the Son; but this is naught but (His) "grantability": ergo etc..

3. Item, antequam Spiritus sanctus habitet in nobis, non dicitur *noster*; sed inhabitat per donationem: ergo dicitur *noster* ratione donabilitatis.

3. Likewise, before the Holy Spirit dwells in us, He is not said (to be) "*our*"; but He indwells in us through being granted [donationem]: therefore He is said (to be) "*our*" by reason of (His) grantability.

Contra: 1. Si ratione donabilitatis: ergo cum donabilitas sit proprietas personalis, non essentialis, videtur[4] solum dici de persona Spiritus sancti; hoc autem falsum, quia dicitur, *Deus noster*.

On the contrary: 1. If by reason of the grantability: therefore since grantability is a personal property, not an essential one, it seems that ("our")[4] is said only of the Person of the Holy Spirit; but this (is) false, because there is said, "*our God*".

2. Item, si ratione donabilitatis: ergo constat, quod non per comparationem ad dantem, sed ad eum cui datur; sed *Filius datus est nobis*[5] etiam magis quam Spiritus sanctus: ergo etc.

2. Likewise, if by reason of the grantability: therefore it is established, that (this is) not through a comparison to the One giving, but to him to whom He is given; but the *Son has been given to us*[5] even more than the Holy Spirit: ergo etc..

3. Item, si ratione donabilitatis: ergo debet convenienter[6] dici donum nostrum.

3. Likewise, if by reason of the grantability: therefore fittingly He ought[6] to be said (to be) "our Gift".

4. Item, si ratione donabilitatis: ergo cum

4. Likewise, if by reason of the grantability:

donabilis sit nobis magis in quantum *sanctus* quam in quantum *spiritus*, melius deberet[7] dici Spiritus sanctus noster; quod tamen non dicitur.

therefore since He is grantable to us more inasmuch as (He is) *Holy* than inasmuch as (He is) *Spirit*, He ought[7] rather to be said (to be) “our Holy Spirit”, which, however, is not said.

CONCLUSIO.

Pronomen possessivum meus vel noster cum copula est *propriisime de Spiritu sancto ratione donabilitatis et per appropriationem dicitur; idem pronomen sine copula iis tantum adiungitur nominibus divinis, quae exprimunt respectum ad nos secundum rationem causae vel correlationis.*

CONCLUSION

The possessive pronoun “my” and/or “our” with the copula “is” is most properly said of the Holy Spirit by reason of (His) grantability and through appropriation; the same pronoun without the copula is only adjoined to those divine names, which express a looking-back to us according to the reckoning of cause and/or correlation.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod *meum* et *nostrum* dupliciter possunt[8] attribui alicui: vel *mediante compositione*, vel *immediate*. Si *mediante compositione*, sic de se ponunt propriam habitudinem circa terminum, scilicet habitudinem *possessionis*,[9] ut cum dicitur: hoc est meum; et hoc modo, quia omnis qui habet spiritum Dei, habet Deum et omnia quae sunt Dei, hoc modo *meum* vel *nostrum* et *tuum*[10] potest dicit de omni, quod in Deo est communiter, sed magis proprie de Filio, qui[11] datus est nobis per incarnationem, maxime autem de Spiritu sancto, *qui est pignus aeternae hereditatis*.[12] Unde concedendum, quod ratione donabilitatis potest inter alias personas ratio possidendi appropriari Spiritui sancto.

I respond: It must be said, that “*my*” and *“our*” can[8] be attributed to something in a twofold manner: either *by means of a composition*, and/or *immediately*. If *by means of a composition*, thus of themselves they posit a proper habitude about the term, that is a habitude *of possession*,[9] as where there is said: “this is mine”; and in this manner, because everyone who has the spirit of God, has God and all which belongs to God, in this manner “*my*” and/or “*our*” and “*your*”[10] can be said of everything, which is commonly in God, on the one hand more properly of the Son, who[11] has been given to us through the Incarnation, and on the other hand, most of all of the Holy Spirit, *who is the Pledge of an eternal inheritance*.[12] Whence it must be conceded, that by reason of (His) grantability among other persons the reckoning of possessing can be appropriated to the Holy Spirit

Potest etiam hoc quod est *nostrum* attribui alicui *immediate*, et sic non dicit habitudinem,[13] sed rationem habitudinis importatae per terminum, cui unitur. Sic enim nulli unitur, nisi quod importat respectum *explicite*, ut pater noster vel meus, vel *implicite*, ut liber meus,[14] id est possessio mea.

That which is “*ours*” can also be attributed to something *immediately*, and in this manner it does not mean a (proper)[13] habitude, but the reckoning of a habitude conveyed through the term, to which it is united. For in this manner, it is united to none, but what conveys a looking-back *in an explicit manner*, as “our” and/or “my” “father”, and/or *in an implicit manner*, as “my[14] book”, that is “my possession”.

Secundum hoc notandum, quod non dicitur . . .

According to this it must be noted, that “*my*” and “*our*” / are not said . . .

---

[1] Ita antiquiores codd. cum ed. 1, dum Vat. cum cod. cc *habuimus*. Paulo infra Vat. *dicatur* loco *dicitur*.
[2] In plurimis mss. et Vat. hic additur *etiam*, quod tamen deest in cod. X et ed. 1 nec non superfluum esse videtur. Mox post *Spiritus* aliqui codd. ut S V X

[1] Thus the more ancient manuscripts, together with edition 1, while the Vatican edition together with codex cc reads *we did not have* [nos non habuimus]. A little below this the Vatican edition has *which is said* [quod dicatur] in place of *that He is said* [quod

addunt *sanctus*, sed incongrue, ut ex corp. quaest. patet.
[3] Videtur supplendum *personaliter*; cfr. Alex. loc. cit. ad 4.
[4] Supple: noster, vel lege cum cod. Y *noster solum dicitur*. Paulo infra post *falsum* unus alterque codex ut bb addit *est*.
[5] Isai. 9, 6.
[6] Plures codd. ut A H I T V W X ee ff cum ed. 1 *deberet congruenter*.
[7] Vat. contra plurimos mss. et ed. 1 *debet*.
[8] Ed. 1 cum uno alteroque cod. ut X hic *potest*, et paulo infra cum pluribus codd. ut A I S T Y Z *ponit* loco *ponunt*.
[9] Aliis verbis: relationem rei habitae ad habentem. Vide Aristot., de Praedicam. in fine, ubi de *Habere* agitur, et V. Metaph. text 29. (IV. c. 23.).
[10] Ita maior pars mss. cum ed. 1, dum aliqui cum Vat. particulas *vel* ac *et* transponunt, aliqui autem ut I ee ff pro *et* ponunt *vel*; cod. A tandem *vel suum* loco *et tuum*. Mox cod. G post *omni* addit *eo*.
[11] Vat. cum aliquibus mss. *quia*, et cod. I *in eo quod*.
[12] Ephes. 1, 14, ubi Vulgata *nostrae* loco *aeternae*. — Paulo ante cod. M post *autem* addit *proprie*.
[13] Supple: propriam, vel cum Vat. *possessionis*, quae et post *sed* cum aliquibus mss. et sex primis edd. adiungit *tantum*.
[14] Unus alterve cod. ut G cum ed. 1 *noster*. Mox in multis mss. et ed. 1 omittitur *mea*.

dicitur].
[2] In very many manuscripts and the Vatican edition, there is here added *also* [etiam], which however is lacking codex X and edition 1, and seems to be superfluous. Next some codices, such as S V and X read *Holy Spirit* [Spiritus sanctus] for *Spirit* [Spiritus], but incongruously, as is clear from the body of the question.
[3] It seems that there is to be supplied *personally*, cfr. Alexander of Hales, loc. cit., in reply to n. 4.
[4] Supply: "our", and/or read with codex Y *"our" alone is said* [noster soum dicitur]. A little below this after *but this* [hoc autem falsum] one or the other codex, such as bb, adds *is* [est].
[5] Isaiah, 9:6.
[6] Very many codices, such as A H I T V W X ee and ff, together with edition 1, read *congruently it ought* [deberet congruenter].
[7] The Vatican edition, contrary to very many manuscripts and edition 1, has the indicative *He ought* [debet].
[8] Edition 1, together with one or the other codex, such as X, reads *it can be that "my" and "our" are attributed to something in a twofold manner* [meum et nostrum dupliciter potest attribui alicui], and a little below this, together with very many codices, such as A I S T Y Z, read *thus of itself it posits* [sic de se ponit].
[9] In other words: a relation of a thing held to one holding. See Aristotle, On the Predicaments, at the end, where *Having* is dealt with, and Metaphysics, Bk V, text 29 (Bk. IV, ch. 23).
[10] Thus the greater part of the manuscripts, together with edition1, while some, together with the Vatican edition, transpose the particles *and/or* [vel] and *and* [et], but some, such as I ee and ff, put *and/or* [vel] in place of *and* [et]; codex A next has *and/or "his"* [vel suum] in place of *and "your"* [et tuum]. Next codex G adds after *everything* [omni] *for this reason* [eo].
[11] The Vatican edition, together with some manuscripts has *because He* [quia], and codex I has *in this that He* [in eo quod].
[12] Eph. 1:4, where the Vulgate has *our* [nostrae] for *an eternal* [aeternae]. — A little before this codex M after *on the other hand* [autem] reads *properly* [proprie].
[13] Supply: proper, and/or together with the Vatican edition read *a habitude of possession* [habitudinem possessionis], which edition also after *but* [sed], together with some manuscripts and six first editions, adds *only* [tantum].
[14] One or the other codex, such as G, together with edition 1, has *our* [noster]. Next in many manuscripts and edition 1, there is read *"a possession"* [possessio].

---

p. 333

meus vel *noster* de aliquo nisi secundum illud nomen, secundum quod dicitur *hoc esse huius*; *hoc autem esse huius* potest dici secundum triplicem habitudinem; aut *informationis*, ut albedo Petri; et hanc

that "*my*" and "*our*" / are not said of something except according to that name, according to which there is said "*this belongs to that*"; *but* "*that this belongs to that*" can be said according to a threefold

habitudinem important nomina, quae significant in abstractione; et quia nihil divinum comparatur ad nos secundum habitudinem informationis, ideo non potest dici de nominibus abstractivis[1] *noster*: ideo non dicitur deitas nostra nec aeternitas nostra.

habitude; either of *being informed*, as white (is) to Peter; and names convey this habitude, which signify in abstraction; and because nothing divine is compared to us according to a habitude of being informed, for that reason there cannot be said of abstractive[1] names "*our*": for that reason there is not said "our Deity" nor "our Eternity".

Potest etiam *secundo* dici *hoc esse huius* secundum habitudinem *causalitatis*; et hanc habitudinem important nomina, quae dicunt actum, ut creator; et quia hanc habitudinem omnino habent divina ad nos, pene[2] de omnibus talibus nominibus dicitur *nostrum*.

Second "*that this belongs to that*" can be said according to a habitude *of causality*; and names convey this habitude, which mean an act, as "creator", and because divine (things) have entirely this habitude toward us, as the tail [pene][2] of all such names there is said "*our*".

Potest etiam *tertio* modo dici[3] *hoc esse huius* secundum habitudinem *correlationis*; et hanc habitudinem important nomina relativa. Sed haec sunt dupliciter: quia quaedam dicunt respectum personae ad *personam*, quaedam autem respectum ad *creaturam*. De his quae dicunt respectum ad personam, non dicitur *meus* vel *noster*. De his autem quae ad nos, ut dominus, magister, recte dicitur *noster*.

"*That this belongs to that*" can also be said[3] in a *third* manner according to the habitude *of correlation*; and relative names convey this habitude. But these are in a twofold manner: because certain ones mean the looking-back of a Person to a *Person*, but certain ones the looking-back to a *creature*. Of those which mean a looking-back to a Person, there is not said "*my*" and/or "*our*". But of those which regard us, as "lord", "master", there is rightly said "*our*".

Dicendum ergo, quod *donabilitas* quantum ad *istum*[4] modum dicendi *nostrum* nihil facit, sicut probant rationes secundo inductae; sed hoc facit *respectus*, quia *spiritus* dicit respectum ad illum cui inspiratur, et hoc sumus nos; ideo dicitur *spiritus noster*. Similter *Deus*, quia imponitur ab actu, quem habet circa nos, ut dicit Damascenus;[5] ideo dicitur *Deus noster*.

It must be said, therefore, that *grantability* as much as regards *that*[4] manner of saying "*our*" causes nothing, just as the reasons brought forward second prove; but it does cause a *looking-back*, because "*spirit*" means a looking-back to that into which it is breathed, and we are that; for that reason He is said (to be) "*our spirit*" Similarly "*God*", because it is imposed by the act, which it has about us, as (St. John) Damascene says;[5] for that reason He is said (to be) "*Our God*".

Est ergo regula, quod de his dicitur *noster*, quae dicunt respectum ad nos secundum habitudinem *causalitatis* vel *correlationis*; et sic patent omnia obiecta.

There is, therefore, a rule, that "*our*" is said of these, which mean a respect to us according to the habitude *of causality* and/or *of correlation*; and thus are clear all the objections.

SCHOLION.

I. Secundum titulum in principio positum quaestio esset tantum specialis de hac locutione, utrum Spiritus sanctus ratione donabilitatis dici possit Spiritus noster; sed in fine argumentorum ad opposit. ponitur quaestio *generalis*, nempe haec, cum quibus divinis nominibus possit coniungi possessivum *noster* vel *meus*; et fere tota responsio ad hanc generalem quaestionem

SCHOLIUM

I. According to the title placed at the beginning there would only be a special question concerning this saying, whether the Holy Spirit by reason of (His) grantability can be said (to be) "our Spirit", but at the end of the arguments in the Contrary, there is posited a *general* question, namely this, 'with what divine names can the possessive "*our*" and/or "*my*" be conjoined', and nearly

pertinet. Acute distinguitur duplex modus, quo pronomina possessiva alicui possunt attribui, scil. vel mediante compositione sive copula (ut per verbum *est*, quin determinetur per aliquod adiunctum, v. g. liber est meus), vel sine copula, v. g. amicus noster. In primo casu ratione *possessionis* divina possunt dici nostra, et quidem tum communia tum etiam propria, quae nobis speciali modo sunt data; quod maxime verificatur de tertia persona. Sic ratione donabiliatis propriisime dici potest: Spiritus sanctus est noster. In secundo casu ratio donabilitatis non est ad propositum, sive ut textus dicit: « Nihil facit, sicut probant rationes secundo inductae »; sed potius attendi debet, qualem habitudinem habeat ad nos *ipse terminus*, cui coniungitur possessivum. Haec habitudo ad *nos* secundum S. Doctorem potest esse triplex. Si haec habitudo est *causalitatis* vel *correlationis* (sub ultima intellige etiam rationem *finis*), tum possessivum illud recte his nominibus divinis uniri potest. Cum autem *spiritus* dicat respectum ad effectum spiritualem, nempe inspirationem, ideo non inepte dici potest *Spiritus noster*. Sed non bene dicitur: Spiritus *sanctus* noster; de quo cfr. Alex. Hal. et Richard. locis citt.

the whole response pertains to this general question. A twofold manner is sharply distinguished, by which possessive pronouns can be attributed to anything, namely either by means of composition or a copula (such as through the verb *is*, which is not determined by any adjunct, e.g. 'the book is mine'), and/or without a copula, e.g. "my friend". In the first case by a reckoning *of possession* divine (things) can be said (to be) ours, and indeed both the common ones as well as the proper ones, which have been given to us in a special manner; which is most of all verified in the Third Person. In this manner by reason of the grantability there can be most properly said. 'The Holy Spirit is ours'. In the second case the reckoning of grantability does not regard the proposed, or as the text says: « It causes nothing, just as the reasons induced second prove »; but it rather ought to be attended, which kind of habitude *the term itself* has for us, to which the possessive is conjoined. This habitude to *us* according to the Seraphic Doctor can be threefold. If this is a habitude *of causality* and/or *of correlation* (under this last understand also the reckoning of an *end*), then that possessive can rightly be united to these divine names. But since "*spirit*" means a looking-back to a spiritual effect, namely to inspiration, for that reason there can, not ineptly, be said "*our Spirit*". But there is not rightly said: '*our* Holy Spirit', concerning which, cf. Alexander of Hales and Richard (of Middleton) in the passages cited below.

II. Idem docent Alex. Hal., S. p. I. a. 63. n. 3. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 5; S. I. q. 36. a. 1. ad 3. — B. Albert., hic a. 10; S. p. I. tr. 8. q. 36. m. 2. partic. 3. 4. 5. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 4. a. 1. — Richard. a Med., hic q. 6. — Aegid. R., hic 3. princ. q. unic. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 59. q. 5. n. 5. 17. — Durand., hic q. 3. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 3.

II. The following teach the same: Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, a. 63, n. 3. — St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 5; Summa., I, q. 36, a. 1, in reply to n. 3. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 10; Summa., p. I, tr. 8, q. 36, m. 2, partic. 3, 4 , and 5. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 4n a. 1. — Richard of Middleton, here in q. 6. — Giles the Roman, here in 3rd. princ., q. sole — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 59, q. 5, nn. 5 and 17. — Durandus, here in q. 3. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 3.

---

[1] Ed. 1 *abstractis*: Vat. contra mss. *abstractionis*. Mox post *aeternitas* plurimi codd. cum ed. 1 omittunt *nostra* ; exstat tamen in codd. F H.

[2] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 *ideo bene* loco *pene*. Dein cod. R *causalibus* pro *talibus*.

[1] Edition 1 has *abstracted* [abstractis]. The Vatican edition, contrary to the manuscripts, has *names of abstraction* [nominibus abstractionis]. Next at the end of the sentence the second *our* [nostra] is omitted by very many codices, together with edition

[3] Ex aliquibus mss. ut G M Y supplevimus *dici*. Paulo infra ed. 1 *respectiva* loco *relativa*. Mox cod. X *duplicia* pro *dupliciter*.
[4] Scil. secundum principalem, quando nempe *nostrum* atttribuitur nomini spiritus *immediate*. — Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 *secundum* loco *istum*; plures codd. cum edd. 2, 3 *illum*. Mox cod. I *adductae* pro *inductae*.
[5] Libr. I. de Fide orthox. c. 9. Vide supra d. 2. dub. 3.

1; however it is extant in codices F and H.
[2] The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, and 3, has *for that reason there is rightly of all such names "our"* [ideo bene etc.]. Then codex R has *causal* [causalibus] for *such* [talibus].
[3] From some manuscripts, such as G M and Y, we have supplied *be said* [dici]. A little below this edition 1 has *names of looking-back* [nomina respectiva] for *relative names* [nomina relativa]. Next codex Y has *twofold* [duplicia] for *in a twofold manner* [dupliciter].
[4] That is, according to the principal one, when namely "*our*" is attributed to the name "spirit" *immediately*. — The Vatican edition, contrary to the manuscripts and edition 1, reads *the second* [secundum] in place of *that* [istud]; very many codices, together with editions 2 and 3, have *that* [illum]. Next codex I has *adduced* [adductae] for *brought forward* [inductae].
[5] On the Orthodox Faith, Bk. II, ch. 9. See above d. 2, dubium 3.

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVIII.

DUBIA CIRCA LITTERAM MAGISTRI.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 333-335.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVIII

DOUBTS ON THE TEXT OF MASTER PETER

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 333-335.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Dub. I.

In parte ista sunt dubitationes circa

Doubt I

In this part there are doubts about the text

litteram, et primo dubitatur de hoc quod dicit, quod *relatio non apparet in hoc nomine spiritus*. Videtur enim dicere falsum, quia spiritus dicitur, quia spiratur: ergo refertur ad spirantem: ergo apparet in eo relatio. *Item*, videtur quod magis appareat quam in hoc nomine *donum*, quia « relativa dicuntur, quae hoc ipsum, quod sunt, aliorum sunt »;[6] sed spiritus eo quod spiritus, habet esse a spirante; donum vero non oportet quod habeat esse a donante: ergo non videtur in hoc tantum apparere relatio.

(of Master Peter), and first there is the doubt [dubitatur] concerning this which he says, that *a relation does not appear in this name "spirit"*. For it seems that he says (something) false, because "spirit" is said, because it is breathed [spiratur]: therefore it is referred to the one breathing: therefore a relation does appear in this. *Likewise*, it seems that (in this name "spirit" a relation) appears more than in this name *"gift*", because « those are said (to be) "relative" which, what they are, are this very (thing) of others »;[6] but "spirit" for this, that (it is) a spirit, has "being" from one breathing; on the other hand, it is not necessary that a "gift" have "being" from one giving: therefore a relation does not seem only to appear in this.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod tam donum quam spiritus dicitur relative; sed tamen relatio magis apparet in hoc nomine *donum* quam in hoc . . .

I respond: It must be said, that "gift" as much as "spirit" is said in a relative manner; but yet a relation appears more in this name "*gift*" than in this . . .

[6] Aristot., de Praedicam. c. de Relativis: Ad aliquid vero talia dicuntur, quaecumque hoc ipsum quod sunt aliorum esse dicuntur. — Aliqui codd. ut V Y *aliorum dicuntur* loco *aliorum sunt*. Paulo ante in Vat. male deest *quam*, exstat autem in mss. et primis edd. Dein cod. dd post *appareat* adiungit verba certe supplenda *relatio in hoc nomine spiritus*.

[6] Aristotle, On Predicaments, ch. "on Relatives": But regarding something such are said, whatsoever 'what' they are, are said to be this very (thing) of others. — Some codices, such as V and Y, have *are said (to be)* [dicuntur] in place of the second *are* [sunt]. A little before this in the Vatican edition there is badly lacking *than* [quam], but it is extant in the manuscripts and first editions. Then codex dd at *appears* [appareat] inserts the certainly to be supplied subject *a relation in this name "spirit"* [relation in hoc nominee spiritus].

p. 334

nomine *spiritus*, quia donum semper dicit respectum ad dantem, spiritus autem[1] non, immo potest accipi absolute.

name "*spirit*", because a gift always means a looking-back to the one giving, but a[1] spirit (does) not, nay it can be accepted in an absolute manner.

Vel aliter dicendum, quod Augustinus non dicit, quod relatio non appareat in hoc nomine *spiritus*, sed quod non appareat in hoc nomine *spiritus sanctus*. Quamvis enim dicatur esse spiritus spiratoris, non tamen dicitur esse spiritus sanctus spiratoris.

And/or it must be said in another manner, that (St.) Augustine does not say, that a relation does not appear in this name "*spirit*", but that it does not appear in this name "*holy spirit*". For although a "spirit" is said to belong to a "breather" [spiratoris], yet a "holy spirit" is not said to belong to a "breather".

Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod magis spiritus dicit habitudinem respicientem *esse* quam donum; dicendum, quod verum est in his quibus accidit esse[2] donum, sed in Spiritu sancto, qui ideo est, quia donum, non habet locum ista obiectio.

To that which is objected, that "spirit" means a habitude looking-back to "*being*" more than "gift" (does); it must be said, that it is true among those to which 'being[2] a gift' accedes, but in the Holy Spirit, who is for this reason, because (He is) the Gift (of

the Father and the Son), that objection does not have a place.

Dub. II.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, quod *Filius nascendo accepit, ut sit ipsa substantia*. Videtur enim male dicere, quia in omni eo quod inest Filio per nativitatem, distinguitur Filius a Patre, quia nativitas est proprietas distinctiva: ergo si[3] Filius nascendo accepit, ut sit essentia vel substantia: ergo Pater in substantia distinguitur a Filio. *Item*, quod Filius nascendo accepit sive quod Filius est nascendo est natum: ergo substantia est nata, si Filius nascendo est substantia. Omne enim, quod nascendo accipitur,[4] a nativiate habet ortum.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod aliqui *distinxerunt* istam locutionem: Filius nascendo est divina substantia sive Deus, quia gerundium[5] potest dicere *concomitantiam*, et sic simpliciter est vera; vel *causam*, et sic est[6] multiplex, quia cum dico: Filius est Deus sive divina substantia, tria dico, scilicet *subiectum*, *compositionem* et *praedicatum*. Potest ergo hoc gerundium *nascendo* dicere causalitatem respectu subiecti, vel respectu compositionis, vel respectu praedicati. Si respectu *subiecti*, tunc est sensus: Filius nascendo etc., scilicet[7] qui est Filius nascendo, vel qui nascendo habet, ut sit Filius, est Deus; et sic est vera. Si respectu *compositionis*, sic est sensus: Filius est Deus nascendo, id est, hoc praedicatum convenit subiecto per nativitatem; et sic adhuc locutio est vera. Si respectu *praedicati*, sic est sensus: Filius est Deus sive substantia divina nascendo, ita quod *nasci* sive nativitas sit principium sive origo Deitatis; et in hoc sensu est falsa.

Magister tamen istam locutionem *non distinguit*, sed simpliciter concedit, et satis probabiliter, quoniam praedicta distinctio non videtur habere radicem.[8] Cum enim

Doubt II

Likewise is asked of this which he says, that *the Son by being born accepted, 'to be the Substance Itself'*. For he seems to speak badly, because in all that [in omni eo] which is in the Son through the (eternal) nativity, the Son is distinguished from the Father, because the nativity is a distinctive property: therefore if[3] the Son by being born accepted, 'to be the Essence and/or Substance': therefore the Father in substance is distinguished from the Son. *Likewise*, it is bound to be [est natum] that 'the Son by being born accepted (it)' or that 'the Son is by being born': therefore the Substance has been born, if the Son by being born is the Substance. For everything, which by being born is accepted,[4] has (its) rise from the nativity.

I respond: It must be said, that some *distinguished* that saying of his: 'the Son by being born is the Divine Substance or God', because a gerund[5] can mean *concomitance*, and thus it is simply true; and/or *a cause*, and thus it is[6] manifold (in meaning), because when I say: 'the Son is God or the Divine Substance', I say three (things), that is, *the subject*, *the composition* and *the predicate*. Therefore this gerund "*by being born*" can mean causality in respect to the subject, and/or in respect to the composition, and/or in respect to the predicate. If in respect to *the subject*, then the sense is: 'the Son by being born etc.,' that is,[7] 'He who is the Son by being born, and/or who by being born has, that He is the Son, is God'; and in this manner it is true. If in respect to *the composition*, thus the sense is: 'the Son is God by being born', that is, this predicate befits the subject through the nativity; and in this manner the saying is still true. If in respect to *the predicate*, in this manner the sense is: 'the Son is God or the Divine Substance by being born', such that 'being born' or the nativity is the principle or origin of the Deity; and in this sense it is false.

However, Master (Peter) *did not distinguish* that saying of his, but simply concedes it, and in a sufficiently probably manner, since the aforesaid distinction does not seem to

gerundium natum sit determinare compositionem — quia omnino nihil est dicere: *homo nascendo* et huiusmodi — et cum compositio praedicati, sive essentiae sive omnium quae attribuuntur Filio, conveniant subiecto per nativitatem, locutio[9] habet veritatem. Nec valent obiectiones in contrarium adductae, quia nativitas non distinguit *illud* quod per nativiatem habetur sive quod est in nascente, sed *eum solum*, qui nascetur; et ideo non sequitur, quod substantia sit distincta, nec quod ipsa nascatur, quamvis per generationem habeatur.[10]

have a basis [radicem].[8] For since a gerund is bound to determine the composition — because it is entirely nothing to say: *a man by being born* and (sayings) of this king — and when composition of the predicate, whether of the Essence or of all those which are attributed to the Son, befit the Subject through the nativity, the saying[9] has truth. Nor are the objections adduced in the contrary valid, because a nativity does not distinguish *that* which through the nativity is had or what is in the one being born, but *him alone*, who is born; and for that reason it does not follow, that the Substance has been distinguished, nor that It Itself is born, even though It is had through the generation.[10]

Dub. III.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, quod *Filius nativitate non est essentia*. Videtur falsum dicere, quia cum nascendo sit essentia, pari ratione videtur, quod nativitate; et hoc videtur per auctoritatem Hilarii in littera.

Doubt III

Likewise is asked of this which he says, that *the Son by the nativity is not the Essence*. It seems that he says (something) false, because since by being born He is the Essence, for an equal reason it seems, that (He is such) by the nativity; and this seems through the authority of (St.) Hilary in the text.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod absque dubio ista est distinguenda: Filius nativitate est divina essentia; quia ablativus potest construi in ratione *formae*, vel in ratione *principii*. Si in ratione *formae*, sic est falsa, quia nativitas non est causa formalis respectu praedicati essentialis. Si in ratione *principii*, sic habet veritatem, quia omnia quae conveniunt Filio, conveniunt ei per nativitatis originem. Sed Magister, quia accipit *gerundium*[11] in ratione *principii*, ideo cum gerundio simpliciter concedit; et quia accipit *ablativum* in ratione *formae*, ideo cum ablativo simplicter negat; magis enim iudicat secundum[12] usum loquendi quam secundum virtutem sermonis.

I respond: It must be said, that without a doubt this (saying) of his is to be distinguished: 'the Son by the nativity is the Divine Essence'; because the ablative ('by the nativity') can be construed in the reckoning of a *form*, and/or in the reckoning of a *principle*. If in the reckoning of *a form*, thus it is false, because the nativity is not the formal cause in respect to the essential predicate. If in the reckoning of a *principle*, thus it has truth, because all which befit the Son, befit Him through the origin of the nativity. But Master (Peter), because he accepts the *gerund*[11] in the reckoning of a *principle*, for that reason simply concedes it with the gerund; and because he accepts the *ablative* in the reckoning of a *form*, for that reason he simply denies it with the ablative; for he judges it more according to the[12] usage of speaking than according to the virtue of the saying.

Dub. IV.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Neque per defectionem, aut protensionem, aut derivationem*; quomodo[13] differunt illa tria?

Doubt IV

Likewise is asked of this which (St. Hilary) says: *Neither through a defection, or extension, or derivation*; in what manner[13] do those three differ?

Respondeo: Quidam dicunt sic, quod per

I respond: Certain ones say in this manner,

defectionem producitur aliquid de materia per formae praeex- / -istentis . . .

that through a *defection* something is produced from matter through the corruption . . .

---

[1] Multi codd. ut A F H K S T V X Y etc. cum ed. 1 addunt *sanctus*.
[2] Vat. cum cod. cc omittit *esse*, quae et mox falso *sed Spiritus sanctus, quia* pro *sed in Spiritu sancto, qui*; lectionem in textum receptam exhibent antiquiores codd. (uno alterove legente *quia* loco *qui*) cum ed. 1.
[3] In aliquibus mss. ut S X et ed. 1 minus apte omittitur *si*.
[4] Vat. contra fere omnes codd. et ed. 1 *accepit*, sed melior est lectio mss., quia generalior.
[5] Aliqui codd. hic, sed plures codd. cum ed. 1 infra bis *gerundivum* loco *gerundium*.
[6] Fide plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *est*.
[7] Vat. *id est*.
[8] Cod. K *rationem*. Paulo ante cod. Y *hanc* loco *istam*.
[9] Vat. cum cod. cc, aliis codd. et ed. 1 refragantibus, *ideo* pro *locutio*.
[10] Eandem difficultatem fere eodem modo solvunt B. Albert., hic a. 7. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 5. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1, a. 2. — Richard. a Med., hic q. 3. — Durand., hic q. 2. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 4. — Et breviter Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 42. m. 3. a. 1. ad 8.
[11] Plures codd. cum ed. 1 hic et paulo infra *gerundivum*.
[12] In cod. N additur *communem*. Cod. O *Magister tamen potius*, et cod. X *Magister enim plus* loco *magis eum*. Mox pauci codd. ut X dd *veritatem* pro *virtutem*. — In solutione huius dubii consentiunt B. Albert., hic a. 8. — Petr. a Tar., et Richard. a Med., hic in expos. lit.
[13] Multi codd. ut A S T V W X etc. *quo* pro *quomodo*.

[1] Many codices, such as A F H K S T V X Y etc., together with edition 1, add *holy* [sanctus].
[2] The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, omits *being* [esse], which also next falsely reads *but the Holy Spirit, because* [sed Spiritus sanctus, quia] for *but in the Holy Spirit, who* [sed in Spiritu sancto qui]; the reading received in the text is exhibited by the more ancient codices (one or the other of which read *because* [quia] in place of *who* [qui]) together with edition 1.
[3] In some manuscripts, such as S and X, and in edition 1, there is aptly omitted the *if* [si].
[4] The Vatican edition, contrary to nearly all the codices and to edition 1, has *accepted* [accepit] for *is accepted* [accipitur], but the reading of the manuscripts is better, because it is more general.
[5] Some codices here, but very many codices together with edition 1 below this, have twice *gerundive* [gerundivum] in place of *gerund* [gerundium].
[6] Trusting in very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *it is* [est].
[7] The Vatican edition reads *that is* [id est] for *that is* [scilicet].
[8] Codex K has *a reason* [rationem].
[9] The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, breaking with the other codices and edition 1, has *for that reason it* [ideo] in place of *the saying* [locutio].
[10] The same difficulty is solved in nearly the same manner by Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 7. — St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 5. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1 a. 2. — Richard of Middleton, here in q. 3. — Durandus, here in q. 2. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 4. — And briefly, Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 42, m. 3, a. 1, in reply to n. 8.
[11] Very many codices, together with edition 1, here and a little below this, read *gerundive* [gerundivum]. [Trans. note: this discussion refers to the gerund ‘by being born’ of Dubium 2 above.]
[12] In codex N there is added *common* [communem].
[13] Many codices, such as A S T V W X etc., have *by what* [quo] for *in what manner* [quomodo].

---

p. 335

praeex- / -istentis corruptionem, sicut ex grano frumenti herba; per *protensionem* producitur aliquid[1] per praeexistentis formae permanentiam et inductionem formae artificialis, sicut vas fit de argento; per *derivationem*,[2] quod producitur per praeexistentis formae permanentiam sola locali mutatione, ut rivus ex fonte et lacus ex rivo.

of a pre-existent form, just as a blade (is) from a grain of wheat [ex grano frumenti herba]; through *extension* [protensionem] something[1] is produced through the permanence of a pre-existing form and the induction of an artificial form, just as a vase is made from silver; through *derivation* (something is produced),[2] which is produced through the permanence of a pre-existing form, solely by a local change, as a river (is) out of a spring and a lake out of a river.

Aliter potest dici, quod materiale principium, ex quo res est, aut est materiale et transiens formaliter, et sic est defectio; aut est materiale et permanens, et sic est protensio; aut est material et permanens et agens, et sic est derivatio; et horum exempla sunt manifesta.[3]

In another manner it can be said, that the material principle, out of which a thing is, is either material and formally transient, and thus there is a defection; or is material and permanent, and thus there is an extension; or is material and permanent and acting, and thus there is a derivation; and their examples have been given [sunt manifesta].[3]

Dub. V.

Doubt V

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicitur: *Aliud est quod accepimus, ut essemus, aliud, ut sancti essemus*. Videtur enim male dicere, quia sicut sine Spiritu Dei non possumus sancti esse, ita nec esse: ergo videtur, quod Spiritu sancto[4] non tantum accepimus, ut essemus sancti, sed etiam ut essemus.

Likewise is asked of this which is said: *One is that which we have accepted, to be, the Other . . . to be holy*. For it seems that he speaks badly, because just as without the Spirit of God we cannot be holy, so neither (can we) be: therefore it seems, that by the Holy Spirit[4] we not only have accepted, 'to be holy', but also 'to be'.

Respondeo: Potest ad hoc dici, quod hoc dictum est per appropriationem. Quamvis enim a Spiritu sancto habeamus *esse* et *sanctum esse*, appropriate tamen habemus sanctum esse: ideo non sic accipi dicitur in nostri esse productione, sicut in sanctificatione.

I respond: Regarding this, there can be said, that this has been said through appropriation. For although from the Holy Spirit we have "*being*" and a "*being holy*", yet in an appropriated manner we have a "holy being": for that reason it is not said to be accepted in the same manner in the production of our "being", as in the sanctification (of it).

Aliter tamen potest dici, quod, sicut *dare* ordinatur ad habendum, ita *accipere*; et quia nullus habet[5] Spiritum sanctum, quantumcumque Spiritus sanctus operetur in eo, nisi qui potest eo frui, et omnis talis est sanctus: ideo Spiritus sanctus non dicitur, proprie loquendo, dari nec accipi nisi a Sanctis.[6]

However, it can be said in another manner, that, just as "*to give*" is ordered to having, so "*to accept*"; and because no one has[5] the Holy Spirit, however so much the Holy Spirit works in him, except him who can enjoy Him, and every such (person) is holy: for that reason the Holy Spirit is not said, properly speaking, to be given nor to be accepted, except by the Saints.[6]

Dub. VI.

Doubt VI

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Tollam de spiritu tuo*, quia hoc non potest dici quantum ad *substantiam*, ergo quantum ad *effectum* sive gratiam: ergo videtur quod gratia transferatur ab uno in alium. *Si tu dicas*, hoc esse dictum per conformitatem; obiicitur, quod[7] pari ratione posset dici, quod tolleret de spiritu aliorum et daret Moysi.

Likewise is asked of this which He says: *I shall take of thy spirit*, because this cannot be said as much as regards *substance*, therefore as much as regards *effect* or grace: therefore it seems that grace is transferred from one to another. *If you say*, that this has been said through conformity; it is objected, that[7] for an equal reason there can be said, that He would take from their spirit and give (it) to Moses.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod illud intelligitur de spiritu quantum ad *effectum*; et haec praepositio *de* importat conformitatem simul[8] et partialitatem, sed non quantum ad partem *constituentem* secundum veritatem, sed secundum

I respond: It must be said, that that (verse) is understood of (his) spirit as much as regards (its) *effect*; and this preposition *of* [de] conveys at once[8] a conformity and a partiality, but not as much as regards a *constituent* part according to truth, but

proportionem; quoniam effectus Spiritus sancti multo plus abundavit in Moyse quam in aliis, ut[9] quasi alii partem gratiae suae viderentur habere. Et dicitur *tollam* quantum ad sollicitudinem, quia dum dona Spiritus sancti aliis sunt communicata, sollicitudo Moysi est diminuta, et pars illius sollicitudinis est[10] aliis commissa.

according to proportion; since the effect of the Holy Spirit abounded much more in Moses than in the others, so that[9] the others almost seemed to have part of his grace. And there is said "*I shall take*" as much as regards solicitude, because while the gifts of the Holy Spirit have been communicated to the others, the solicitude of Moses was diminished, and part of his solicitude was[10] committed to the others.

---

[1] In multis mss. et ed. 1 omittitur *aliquid*. Paulo infra cod. X *sicut nascitur de argento statua* loco *sicut vas fit de argento*.
[2] Supple: producitur aliquid.
[3] Haec verba Hilarii simili modo explicantur a B. Alberto, hic a. 9, et a S. Thoma, Petro et Richardo, hic in expos. lit. S. Thomas tamen verba *per protensionem* intelligit sic: quando producitur ex re manente coniuncta sibi, sicut ramus ex arbore.
[4] Ita codd. et ed. 1; cod. Y bene *a Spiritu sancto*; Vat. *Spiritum sanctum*.
[5] Cod. Y *accipit*, qui et paulo supra post *Aliter* omittit *tamen*. Mox cod. Z *habet* pro *potest*.
[6] Vat. *nisi Sanctis et a Sanctis*. — Plura de hoc vide supra d. 14. a. 2. q. 1. et 2.
[7] Aliqui codd. ut F G H Z etc. cum ed. 1 *quia*.
[8] Fide mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, substituimus *simul* loco *similiter*. Paulo ante cod. Z cum ed. 1 post *importat* satis bene addit *ibi*. Mox post *partem* ponendo *constituentem* sequimur lectionem plurimum mss. ut G H L O ee ff et ed. 1, quae in se clarior est et confirmari videtur minus apta lectione multorum codd. *construentem*, cod. R *continentem*; Vat. habet *conferentem et continentem*. Explicationem sensus accipe ex Richardo, hic in expos. lit dicente: Haec praepositio *de* non dicit ibi partitionem substantiae Spiritus sancti *vel gratiae, quae fuit in Moyse*, sed quod aliis daretur gratia Spiritus sancti in minori abundantia, ita quod haberent quasi rationem partis respectu abundantiae gratiae, quae erat in Moyse. Vel loquitur de ablatione quoad usum sollicitudinis, non quoad habitum. — Vide etiam S. Thomam et Petrum, hic in expos. lit.
[9] Vat. *ut quod alii quasi*, sed obstant fere omnes antiquiores codd. cum ed. 1.
[10] Ed. 1 omittit *est*.

---

[1] In many manuscripts and edition 1 there is omitted *something* [aliquid]. A little below this codex X reads *just as a statue is born from silver* [sicut nascitur de argento statua] in place of *just as a vase is made from silver* [vas fit de argento]. [Trans. note: concerning *defection*, cf. Master Peter's Distinction XVIII, p. 320, footnote 11; here the Seraphic Doctor's example of *defection* is taken from the evangelical parable of the grain of wheat. St. Hilary's term *dissection* more accurately speaks to the nature of divine generation, in that it denies that division according to substance, which is common to material organisms.]
[2] Supply: something is produced.
[3] These words of (St.) Hilary are explained in a similar manner by Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 9, and by St. Thomas, (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, and by Richard (of Middleton), here in the exposition of the text. St. Thomas, however, understands the words *through extension* [per protensionem] in this manner: when it is produced out of a thing remaining conjoined to itself, as a branch (grows) out of a tree.
[4] Thus the codices and edition 1; codex Y righly has *by the Holy Spirit* [a Spiritu sancto]; the Vatican edition reads *that we not only have accepted the Holy Spirit* [quod Spiritum sanctum non tantum accepimus].
[5] Codex Y reads *accepts* [accipit], which also a little above this omits *However* [tamen]. Next codex Z reads *has* [habet] for *can* [potest].
[6] The Vatican edition reads *except to the Saints and by the Saints* [nisi Sanctis et a Sanctis]. See more on this above in d. 14, a. 2, qq. 1 and 2.
[7] Some codices, such as F G H Z etc., together with edition 1, read *because* [quia].
[8] Trusting the manuscripts and editions 1, 2 and 3, we have substituted *at once* [simul] in place of *similarly* [similiter]. A little before this codex X, together with edition 1, after *conveys* [importat] adds sufficiently well *there* [ibi]. Next after *as regards a* [ad partem] we, by placing *constituent* [constitutentem], follow the reading of very many manuscripts, such as G H L O ee and ff, and edition 1, which in itself is clearer and seems to be confirmed by the less apt reading of many codices *construing* [construentem], codex R *containing* [continentem]; the Vatican edition has *conferring and containing* [conferentem et continentem]. An explanation for this can be taken from Richard (of Middleton), here in the exposition of the text, where

he says: This preposition *of* [de] does not mean there a partition of the substance of the Holy Spirit *and/or of the grace, which was in Moses*, but that the grace of the Holy Spirit would be given them in a lesser abundance, such that they would have a quasi reckoning of a part in respect to the abundance of grace, which was in Moses. And/or he speaks of a removal, in regard to the use of solicitude, not in regard to the habit. — See also St. Thomas and (Bl.) Peter (of Tarentaise), here in the exposition of the text.

[9] The Vatican edition has *such that others almost* [ut quod alii] for *so that others almost* [ut quasi alii], but nearly all the more ancient codices, together with edition 1, withstand this.

[10] Edition 1 omits *was* [est].
